

August 23, 1965

OUTSTANDING YOUNG EDUCATORS NATIONAL WINNERS HONORED IN WASHINGTON, D.C.—U.S. JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SPONSORS EVENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a soft-spoken 5th and 6th grade teacher from Jackson, Miss.; a talented art teacher from Devil's Lake, N. Dak.; a courageous 10th and 12th grade English teacher from Atlanta; and a demure 6th grade teacher from Richmond, Va., were recently named the four national winners in the first annual Outstanding Young Educator Awards program at the Statler-Hilton hotel in the Nation's Capital.

Each of the four won a \$2,000 scholarship with which to further their education and a handsome trophy presented by James A. Skidmore, Jr., president of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce at the awards banquet attended by leading educators, Government officials, business and civic leaders. The 4 winners were selected from over 30,000 nominees in city and State competition cosponsored by the U.S. Jaycees and World Book Encyclopedia.

The national victors are: Helen Lee Coleman, 29, of 4212 Kingcrest Parkway, Richmond, Va., sixth grade teacher of English at Thomas Jefferson School; James Morgan Hale, 32, of 1150 Clifton Road NE., Atlanta, Ga., who teaches English at Roosevelt High School; Robert Hal Moore, 30, art education teacher at the Devil's Lake Public School in Devil's Lake, N. Dak.; and Betty Helen Quinn, 29, of 3425 Casa Grande Circle, a fifth and sixth grade teacher at Gallo-way Elementary School in Jackson, Miss.

The 4 were selected from finalists representing 38 States, including the District of Columbia. Contestants must be teachers 21 through 35 years of age who teach the 1st and including the 12th grades.

The West Virginia finalist was Martha Rose Roy of Philippi. Miss Roy received her B.S. degree from Alderson-Broadus College in 1951 and her M.A. from West Virginia University in 1957. She received an honor scholarship from Alderson-Broadus and was graduated magna cum laude. Miss Roy is chaplain of Alpha Delta Kappa—women teachers' honorary sorority, and president of the Teachers Association. The teachers of Taylor County selected her to represent the county in the Miss WVEA contest during the centennial year. She is a business education teacher at Grafton High School in Grafton, W. Va.

The 38-State contestants came to Washington Thursday, July 8. Their original selection was made by the teacher's school principal on the basis of national standards developed by educators.

The criteria followed by the panel of judges included: professional background; teaching skill; instructional procedures; self-evaluation and contribution to the profession, community and the Nation.

The winners were selected by Dr. Galen Jones, director for the advancement of secondary education of the National Education Association; Dr. Quentin Earhart, assistant superintendent of

the Maryland State Board of Education; and John Koontz, associate superintendent of the District of Columbia Schools.

Helen Lee Coleman attended Marymount College in Tarrytown, N.Y. She majored in English and was awarded her B.A. degree in 1957, and is vice president of the College Alumnae Association and a member of Delta Kappa Gamma. She was recently a speaker at the English teachers conference at the University of Virginia.

James Morgan Hale, of Atlanta, is president and former treasurer of the Atlanta Area English Club; national director and State vice president of the Georgia Jaycees. He attended Emory University, and received his B.A. degree in 1953 and M.A.T. in 1959.

As newly elected vice president of the Jaycees, Hale read a newspaper item about a routine zoning permit issued to the Ku Klux Klan for the purpose of building the national headquarters across the street from an Atlanta elementary school. Hale went to work and secured several thousand signatures necessary to secure a public hearing, and finally was able to arouse the community in stopping the project.

This quick success for Hale and the Jaycees brought nationwide recognition but it is said it cost Hale and his family many sleepless nights.

Robert Hal Moore teaches in the Devil's Lake Public Schools. He attended Minot State Teachers College and the University of North Dakota. He is a member of Delta Phi Delta and was one of the 10 outstanding art teachers in the Midwest. His works and those of his students have been hung in Washington, D.C.; Grand Forks and Minot, N. Dak.; and Philadelphia. He received his B.A. degree in 1956. He believes that the strongest characteristic of a teacher should be the ability to inspire and to motivate. He has written articles for magazines and is writing a book on art methods for students.

Betty Helen Quinn received her B.A. degree in 1958 and her M.E. in 1961. During her college years she received the Kappa Delta Epsilon Award and membership in "Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities." She attended Belhaven and Mississippi Colleges. Miss Quinn believes the strongest characteristic of a teacher can be judged by the rapport she is able to establish with her students.

Speakers at the OYE luncheon included Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, and Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California. It was my privilege to be present for this enjoyable and rewarding portion of the program.

Panel discussions included: "National Planning and Control in American Education—Promise or Peril"; "American Education Should Be Concerned With General Pupil Development"; and "American Education Should Be Focused on Academic Excellence."

Allen Ludden, CBS television star of the program "Password" was guest speaker at the awards banquet.

Mr. President, commendations are due the U.S. Jaycees and World Book Encyclopedia for their sponsorship of this

valuable activity. By recognizing excellence among our younger educators we encourage a strengthening and broadening of that excellence.

GI HELP FOR VIETNAM

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the maintenance of good morale and esprit de corps among our troops in fighting in the hills and valleys of South Vietnam has been and will continue to be a matter of great importance. The question has been raised frequently whether these brave men who are carrying the burden of war in that faraway land realize why they are fighting and what they are fighting for.

I recently came into possession of a letter from one American GI who has been in South Vietnam for 4 years, training the Vietnamese special forces in guerrilla tactics. This letter was addressed by Maj. Robert Furman, of Chicago, to his friend, Mrs. Ruth Sheldon Knowles.

Mrs. Knowles, a writer and lecturer, became acquainted with Major Furman while visiting South Vietnam a few months ago. This illustrious Oklahoma journalist also visited her son while touring a number of our furthest outposts in the jungles of that embattled country.

Major Furman, Mrs. Knowles tells me, is a bachelor who went to South Vietnam after serving in Korea and the Philippines. Despite his grim and dangerous tasks in the violence-ridden villages and countryside, Major Furman has established himself as a friend, as well as an adviser, teacher and leader for those South Vietnamese who want freedom.

Major Furman has adopted two blind Vietnamese girls, 15 and 16 years old. This American Army major is financing the education of these Vietnamese girls at the Perkins School for the Blind in Watertown, Mass. He is arranging for them to learn teaching skills, and when he retires in 2 years, and after the girls finish their training, he has planned for the three of them to return to Saigon to teach in a school for the blind to prove to the Vietnamese that blind people can overcome the handicap.

The helpfulness, the humanity which this American soldier is demonstrating, is typical of the American way. Mrs. Knowles, upon returning from South Vietnam, wrote:

This is a typical American value—this is what Americans do wherever they go, even in a war, because this is the American nature.

Major Furman's letter to Mrs. Knowles, dated August 4, 1965, reflects a measure of understanding and high morale which deserves our careful attention. He also reflects upon recent events within this country, from the perspective of one who is bearing a burden for all of us. As a document, it affords timely insight, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AUGUST 4, 1965.

DEAR RUTH: I just got back from a stay at the hospital. Nothing serious, just a gut infection from amebic dysentery. I'm OK now and raring to go. I have a stack of

August 23, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20487

Britain, where the government has recently taken major steps to hold down prices. In Japan, where the cost of living had been rising especially swiftly, living costs actually fell in a recent month.

The U.S. cost-of-living index, on the other hand, has begun to move up at a faster pace. In recent years, the U.S. index has risen at the relatively mild rate of about 1.2 percent annually. In only the first half of this year, however, the rise has amounted to 1.1 percent, a gain that clearly indicates the recent period of 1.2 percent annual gains may be over.

The rapid pace of the American economy, of course, has tended to put increasing upward pressure on U.S. prices. American factories, which a few years ago were using less than 80 percent of their full capacity, now are operating at about 90 percent, according to Federal estimates. This rate, history suggests, is dangerously near the level at which prices begin to move up swiftly.

Similar pressure on U.S. prices is indicated by labor statistics. The rate of unemployment among married men, the backbone of the labor force, amounts to only 2.3 percent, down sharply from 5.1 early in the current economic expansion. On top of all this, the prospect of rising defense outlays for Vietnam can only add inflationary pressure.

There appears to be no such mounting price pressure in many countries that compete with the United States in world markets. A recent report by New York's Chase Manhattan Bank states that the "tempo of Europe's economic expansion has slowed considerably this year" and attributes the slowdown to "restrictive, anti-inflationary policies on the part of most governments."

For instance, according to the report, wage rates in most European countries are rising more slowly than a year ago. In France, typically, wages climbed only 2 percent in the first half of 1965, down from a 3.2 percent gain in the like 1964 period. It also should be noted that the Vietnam war is placing relatively little strain on most European economies; Britain, in fact, recently announced a \$616 million slash in its annual defense budget, as part of its fight against inflation.

A study by the Boston Federal Reserve Bank, discussed in the July issue of the bank's monthly business review, also indicates the U.S. competitive position in world markets may be getting rapidly weaker. The study, which covered some 200 types of consumer goods, concludes that in foreign markets "our position has sharply deteriorated."

In addition to developments on the price front, there is some increasing concern over the make-up of U.S. trade statistics. Studies indicate the big surpluses of recent years reflect more than simply successful competition in the world markets. They also reflect such factors as Government grants and exports by U.S. companies to their foreign-based subsidiaries. One study, which scrutinized the trade figures for a recent year, found that a \$5.4 billion trade surplus melted down to a \$500 million surplus after such factors were discounted.

To be sure, it is by no means certain that Uncle Sam is about to lose his position as titan of world trade. It is not clear, for instance, that the recent jump in U.S. export prices signals a long-term trend or that Europe's drive against inflation will succeed. Nevertheless, the record of recent months suggests that continuing massive trade surpluses are by no means guaranteed. Without such surpluses, it is hardly necessary to add, this country's balance-of-payments problem, already worrisome, could become dire.

ALFRED L. MALABRE, Jr.

APPORTIONMENT

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at

this point in the Record an editorial "Tydings to the Rescue" published in the Washington Sunday Star on August 22, and an editorial entitled "Fair, but Also Effective," published in the Washington Daily News on August 20, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Aug. 22, 1965]

TYDINGS TO THE RESCUE

It is no surprise to hear that a new move is afoot to retain all of Baltimore's three congressional seats—one of which would be sacrificed, and properly so, under the redistricting plan approved by the Maryland Legislature this year.

The fact that the instigator of this plot is Maryland's Senator JOSEPH TYDINGS, however, has come as a shock to nearly everyone especially his friends.

For it was Senator TYDINGS, during the debate on legislative reapportionment, who stood in the front rank of the Senate liberals who lambasted the Dirksen amendment. No one yelled louder than he about the sanctity of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote rule. For what, after all, is as precious as the value of a citizen's vote?

Well, the exigencies of politics, apparently, are one thing as precious. In any event, without dwelling too long on the principle of the thing, Senator TYDINGS has concluded that Baltimore's three incumbent Members of the House, all of whom have considerable seniority, are simply too valuable politically speaking, for Maryland to lose. So he has urged the congressional delegation to draft a new scheme, for presentation to the State legislature, which would preserve Baltimore's representation.

As the Star's James Rowland pointed out the other day, the delegation had no luck whatever in a similar venture a year ago. There is little question, however, that it will try again.

And the shame of it is that this venture will pose another hurdle for the equitable redistricting plan already adopted. The Baltimore Congressmen involved launched a move some weeks ago to pigeonhole the adopted plan until the electorate votes it up or down in the 1966 elections. That move could be circumvented, however, if the legislature readopts its plan in January as an emergency measure. And it should do precisely that—Senator TYDINGS' efforts to the contrary notwithstanding.

[From The Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Aug. 20, 1965]

FAIR, BUT ALSO EFFECTIVE

Senator DIRKSEN again is going to bat for his constitutional amendment on the apportionment of representation in State legislatures. He should. His cause is logical and equitable.

Recently, the Senator was narrowly defeated in his proposal to offer the people the right to make their own decision, in each State, on how their legislatures should be divided. This amendment simply would have given the voters the right to choose whether one house of their legislature should be allotted along lines other than a strict population basis.

The amendment lost because it was seven votes short of the two-thirds majority required for a constitutional proposal.

But in the 1966 session of Congress, or in the next Congress—eventually—an amendment such as Senator DIRKSEN advocates will be submitted to the States. Sooner or later the people, understanding the problem, will demand the return of their own right—the right to decide, for themselves.

The liberals who oppose the Dirksen amendment are wrong on two counts. They are wrong because they, or all people, are denying the voters the right to choose for themselves the form of their own State legislatures. And they are wrong because they persist in mixing the issues.

The only issue in the Dirksen amendment is the right of the people to decide.

But the liberals insist on reading it as a backhanded attempt to perpetuate malapportioned legislatures.

There are malapportioned legislatures. That's why the voters of Tennessee, for example, went to the Supreme Court and got a ruling that if the Tennessee legislature, as the State constitution required, did not apportion itself fairly the courts would undertake the job.

The Dirksen amendment does not shut the door on the reform of legislative apportionment. It is an insurance against misapportionment. Because it provides that any allocation of legislative districts must be approved by the voters. Moreover, in his new version of the Dirksen amendment the Senator proposes that any legislative plan submitted to the voters first must have been offered by a legislature in which at least one house was properly apportioned on a population basis.

The Dirksen amendment proposes to make legislatures both fairly representative and effectively representative.

So we hope Senator DIRKSEN keeps up his fight along this line. And that those who have been misrepresenting the purpose of the amendment will get their sights in focus, so they will see that this is a way toward the goals they claim to favor—fair and effective representation in State legislative halls.

FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE OF MARK TRICE IN THE SENATE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our very fine secretary to the minority, Mark Trice. I have not served in the Senate nearly so long as many of my fellow Senators, but in the time that I have been here Mark Trice has always been an excellent source of information and a reliable counselor. He has always been most helpful to both me and my staff. Forty-five years of exemplary service is certainly an enviable record.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, it is a distinct personal pleasure for me to join my colleagues in saluting Mark Trice on the occasion of his 45th anniversary of service to the Senate.

In compiling this proud record he has been unfailingly cheerful and competent. It is amazing how he keeps tabs on what is going on and I do not know what the minority side would do without his guidance and counsel.

My association with Mark precedes my brief service as a Member of this body because in the thirties I worked in a senatorial office while going to law school and came to know him then. Thirty years ago the pace of the Senate was slower than it is today, but Mark has kept up with the times and runs things just as well now as he did then.

I count him as a friend. I look to him for guidance. I wish for him many more years of serving the Senate and his country in his sensitive and important position.

August 23, 1965

mail to answer so I am now buckling down to it. I'll never be a correspondent, I hate to write. I'm crummy at it but will give it the old college try.

Things are a little busy here and tension seems to be mounting, particularly among the uninitiated. With Special Forces troops, however, this is old hat. We have been doing business at the same old stand for a long time and don't panic easily.

That was a real fine letter you wrote, and the boys and I appreciate what you have said and the things you are doing. Maybe when you are in college areas, you can set some of those mixed-up kids straight. You know, the demonstrators. I would rather fight over here than in Anytown, U.S.A. If some of those kids saw some of the men, women and children butchered by the Viet Cong maybe they would be a little less inclined to talk, and more ready to help. I can't believe that today's American youth are any less courageous and possess any less love of country than they did in the past, but the papers we read sure give us that impression.

The guys over here don't expect to be extolled as heroes and don't expect the folks back there to raise monuments to them. They have a job to do and they can see the need. It does, however, get mighty sickening to read about those New York kids burning draft cards and probably going off to a movie or hamburger joint afterwards bragging about it. Our guys, same age, same country, work, fight, bleed, and die so those punks can theorize. I'd like to see some demonstrations for our country, yes and wave the flag, too. I have never been able to see any shame in being a flag waver.

There is no one who wants peace anymore than the guy who is going to do the fighting and possibly the dying. I want peace but not at the cost of liberty.

Turning the other cheek and setting the course by destroying our arsenal is suicide. It has never worked and never will. Strength is the way to peace. Nobody in their right minds will attack anyone who will pulverize them. They only attack when they are sure they can win.

Well, how about that for a tirade? Off soap box. Thanks again kiddo and keep up the good work.

Bob.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN WATER SHORTAGE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, millions of people in the Northeast never stopped to realize the value of water until they were stopped by the acute water shortage plaguing their area. The drought, worst in the area's recorded history, has lasted for 45 months, beginning in 1961, and deficiencies can be expected to continue for at least another year even if there is normal precipitation during the coming year.

New York City depends on reservoirs in the mountain upland areas of the Hudson and Delaware River watersheds whose present resources stand at only 48 percent capacity.

Half of Philadelphia's water supply is taken directly from the Delaware River at the Torresdale intake, and the remainder comes from the Schuylkill River.

The issue is of the interrelated supply for the two cities. New York City, having the advantage of geographic proximity to the headwaters of the Delaware River, affects the needs of Philadelphia by its diversions out of the

river drainage. The low flow of the Delaware increasingly threatens the Philadelphia water supply with saline contamination as salt water continues to intrude toward the Torresdale intake.

In 1954 the U.S. Supreme Court authorized New York City to take 490 million gallons a day from the Delaware for that city's use. The Court stipulated, however, that New York City must release back into the Delaware 200 million gallons a day from other New York reservoirs to supplement the volume of flow in the river. On June 14, 1965, New York City stopped the required releases to conserve its own supplies.

This and low runoff from the spring thaws in the mountain area have caused the water volume in the Delaware downstream from New York to reach a record low, and the extent of the salt water line threatening Philadelphia an alltime high. The required 200 million gallons a day releases were resumed in July 1965 by order of the Delaware River Basin Commission effective until September 10, 1965.

The current crisis has not yet reached the proportions of actual water deprivation to the consumer. The water shortage is defined in terms of rapid depletion of reserve resources since the normal sources have been used up. The drought has forced the cities to operate on inadequate and hazardous reserves. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has stated that New York City's shortage is more critical than Philadelphia's, but this situation cannot be considered in isolation. The obvious problems of a water shortage in New York City are widened and deepened by their impact on cities with water supplies interrelated to New York's.

These problems have been growing for 4 years. Last week the President called a conference of Governors, mayors and Senators from the stricken areas. I participated in this conference then, and in subsequent meetings I heard many recommendations for alleviating drought conditions, such as metering, controlling leakage, public appeals, further research, appeals to industry and privately owned reservoirs, and so forth.

At my request, Mr. Theodore Schad, senior specialist in engineering and public works at the Library of Congress, prepared a memorandum on previous recommendations to ease the water shortage problem. At present the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is studying water quality conditions in the Hudson River and New York City engineers are planning emergency and limited use of the Hudson River. As seen from Mr. Schad's study, which I will submit for publication in the Record, there is nothing new in the concept of using the Hudson River as a primary source of water supply for New York City.

In July 1951, an engineering panel on water supply made recommendations to the mayor of New York City on the subject of future water sources for the city. Its letter of transmittal stated that the committee believed that the Hudson River with filtration was the best source

and should be developed as the next step for meeting the future needs of the city. The quality of the water after filtration was the same or better than the present sources, the cost much lower—a saving of \$100 million over the 40-year period—the volume eight times the present average annual use by New York. Use of the Hudson would stop encroachment upon mountain streams and would be flexible in its utilization.

Despite these recommendations, New York City decided to use the western branch of the Delaware River for expansion of the city's water supply during the 1950's on the assumption of better quality, which has turned out to be faulty. Had New York City followed the committee's recommendations which enumerated the assets of the Hudson as the primary water source, the most critical problems facing the area today would have been solved. But it does little good to cry over spilt water. With the problem facing the New York City administration, and solutions based on extensive studies before them, it would seem that there is going to be a great duplication of research and factfinding efforts by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Secretary Udall. Hopefully, the solution which seems obvious to an impartial and informed source, Mr. Schad, will become obvious in the very near future to New York City officials. The Hudson should be developed as the primary source of water for New York, thus allowing Philadelphia and nearby New Jersey cities unthreatened use of the Delaware. There need not any longer be an objection to using purified sewerage water since many major cities do so.

In the light of sound engineering facts, it is not justifiable for New York City to utilize its geographical upstream position on the Delaware to deprive cities further south of use of the Delaware water when it has a much better source in all technical aspects, namely the Hudson. And why should Philadelphia be endangered unnecessarily by the wasteful and shortsighted plans of the New York City administration?

As New York City's follies come into public view, the Federal Government has taken steps to effect a compromise between the two cities in the form of a water bank, which would store the required releases into the Delaware in reservoirs for use by New York City unless the security of Philadelphia's water supply is further endangered by salt water. I commend the Johnson administration for its efforts to bring about a solution to the problem, but I wonder why the administration is taking steps to make amends for the mistakes of New York City in its present policies, when the need for an overhaul of the New York City water supply system is obvious from an engineering standpoint.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Schad's report to which I referred earlier be printed in the Record.

August 23, 1965

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1965.

To: Hon. HUGH SCOTT.

From: Theodore M. Schad, senior specialist
in engineering and public works.

Subject: Water shortage in the Northeastern States.

This is in response to your request for ideas as to ways to alleviate drought conditions in the Northeastern States, with particular reference to the water shortage in New York City and its effect on the flow in the Delaware River.

A report to the President dated July 21, 1965, by the Water Resources Council, entitled "Drought in Northeastern United States," outlines a whole series of steps which the Council recommends be taken by the Federal Government to alleviate drought conditions throughout the Northeastern United States. As I understand you received a copy of the report from the White House, there is no need for me to reiterate the numerous recommendations that are included in that report. From the viewpoint of the State of Pennsylvania and the Delaware River Basin, however, it appears that increased attention should be given to one point that is mentioned in the Council's report. I refer to the possibility of utilizing the Hudson River as a primary source for the New York City water supply.

On page 9, the report mentions that New York City "has begun an engineering reconnaissance to construct an emergency pumping plant on the Hudson River." On page 13 it indicates that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is carrying out a study of water quality conditions in the Hudson River. Actually, the use of the Hudson River as a primary source of water supply has been considered and favorably recommended by eminent engineers as far back as the early years of the present century. In fact, it could be said that New York City brought on the present water crisis, both for itself and Philadelphia, by its failure to accept such a recommendation when it was most recently made in 1951. Instead, it proceeded to construct the Cannonsville reservoir on the west branch of the Delaware as the next increment of its water supply system. The extended drought over the last 4 years has resulted in the inability of this small watershed to produce the flow needed by New York City and downstream users on the Delaware. Although it may be too late to help very much during the present drought period, it would appear desirable, from the viewpoint of Philadelphia, to bring pressure to bear on New York City to develop the Hudson River as a major source of water supply, so that even more serious water shortages can be avoided during future periods of drought.

The Hudson River has many advantages as a source of supply for New York City. For example, the average discharge of the Hudson River at Green Island near Albany for the 10-year period of record 1946-56 was 10,430,000 acre-feet or roughly 9.4 billion gallons a day. This is almost eight times the present average annual use by the city of New York of 1.25 billion gallons per day. The minimum flow of record is 1,270 cubic feet per second at this point or about 800 million gallons per day.

By contrast the flow of the Delaware at Montague, N.J., just below Fort Jervis, is less than 4,800,000 acre-feet and the minimum discharge has been as low as 412 cubic feet per second (265 m.g.d.) less than one-third of the water available in the Hudson River during the lowest period of record. The west branch of the Delaware, from which the newest water supply for the city of New York has been developed in the Cannonsville Reservoir, is an even smaller stream having an average flow of only 772,000 acre-feet (690

m.g.d.) with a minimum discharge recorded, without regulation, of only 32 cubic feet per second.

These facts were not unknown to the city of New York when it made its decision to go to the west branch of the Delaware River for the expansion of its water supply during the decade of the 1950's. In July 1951, an engineering panel on water supply made recommendations to the mayor's committee on management survey of the city of New York on the subject of future water sources of the city of New York. The panel consisted of Thorndike Saville, Sr., W. W. Horner, Louis R. Howson, and Abel Wolman, four the most distinguished consulting engineers in the field of municipal water supply in the United States. Among other things the committee stated (letter of transmittal, p. xiv):

"After consideration of all available sources, the panel believes the Hudson River, with filtration, offers the best solution and that it should be developed as the next step for meeting the future needs of New York City. Among the factors influencing this opinion are:

"(a) By standard filtration process, Hudson River water can be made equal to, if not better in quality than, that now supplied to the city of New York. The project also has an important security value resulting from the ability of the Hudson River to free itself of radioactive or biological contamination.

"(b) The development cost per m.g.d. of additional safe supply is much the lowest, being less than one-third that of any upland source to supply comparable quantities.

"(c) It is also lowest in annual cost, saving the city at least \$100 million prior to the year 2000 as compared to the proposed Cannonsville development of the board of water supply.

"(d) It can be initially developed to moderate proportions, and readily enlarged to meet increased demands, unlike most upland sources.

"(e) It is most flexible in its utilization, requiring substantial operation only during unusually dry periods when water from the upland sources is insufficient.

"(f) The Hudson—particularly with the upland storage, which in Sacandaga Reservoir alone is seven times the volume of the Kensico Reservoir—is substantially inexhaustible.

"(g) No delays due to interstate negotiations or application to the U.S. Supreme Court are required for an initial Hudson River development in contrast to any proposals for new upland Delaware sources.

"(h) The encroachment of New York City upon mountain streams for water supply uses will be stopped for many years, thus preserving such streams for fishing, wildlife, recreation and other conservation uses. In addition the city will not be charged for taxes on lands taken for water supply purposes, for policing, for sanitation and other costs required by law when upland areas are taken for water supply reservoirs."

The panel proposed a plan for pumping water from an intake in the Hudson River just below Hyde Park, N.Y. From this point it would be pumped to a filtration plant near Chelsea, N.Y., where it would be chlorinated, filtered, and pumped into the Delaware aqueduct and delivered to the existing New York City water supply reservoirs. The panel stated (p. 79): "It is shown that by ordinary standard filtration processes Hudson River water can be made to equal, if not better, the quality of water now supplied to New York City."

The committee made several other recommendations which are still pertinent with respect to dealing with the New York City water supply problem. Among these was a recommendation that consideration be given to more extensive metering of customer services, and that more attention be given to reduction of leakage and waste from the water distribution system. The panel sug-

gested that the latter source might lead to a saving of 150 million gallons a day without curtailing or restricting any proper water usage.

The existence of this report and earlier reports going back to 1900 by competent engineers, recommending the Hudson as an obvious source of water for New York City suggests that development of the Hudson to a far greater extent than the reinstallation of the emergency intake and pumping plant at Chelsea is warranted.

Accordingly, it would appear desirable for Pennsylvania to insist in every way possible that New York City be forced to develop the Hudson River supplies even to the extent of additional storage on the Hudson, if such is needed, so that the Hudson would become a major permanent source of water supply for the New York City metropolitan area leaving the Delaware for use of growing industry and municipalities in the Delaware Valley.

THEODORE M. SCHAD.

THE CRITICAL COIN SHORTAGE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Nation has for more than a year been involved in a critical coin shortage crisis. The problems which this issue raises for American commerce in all 50 States has been well publicized. The Government genuinely has tried to wrestle with this problem and has considered all sorts of voluntary and involuntary means of finding a solution to this problem.

Recently—and to my deep regret—the Congress authorized a desilverization of our coinage and a cutback in the silver content of the 50-cent piece.

But citizens generally have not addressed themselves to this problem which is why I am particularly impressed with the recommendation of a newspaper editor from my State calling on citizens to agree among themselves not to hoard coins and pledge themselves to oppose hoarding or speculating in coins.

This is a subject that I hope will be taken seriously by many communities across this country because it involves individual responsibility in solving what is a serious problem for all American business and indeed for the future of the U.S. monetary system.

I ask unanimous consent that the column of Paul K. Gardner in the Lovelock Review Miner be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHOM DO YOU LOVE?

(An editorial by Paul K. Gardner)

Do you love your community?

Do you love your State?

Do you love America?

Or do you only love yourself?

These questions are to the point. What is happening to our monetary system is involved. An outflowing of local patriotism could do much to relieve present difficulties.

We estimate that Lovelock people have stored away over 5,000 silver dollars. They are engaged at present in putting half dollars and quarters in their socks and under their mattresses. Some are foolishly storing silver certificates. An estimated \$10,000 is being hoarded here.

A very few Pershing County business people are grabbing all the change they can get their hands on and concealing the fact.

We wouldn't be surprised that there are millions of silver dollars and other coins taken out of circulation in Reno. Hoarding in Nevada could amount to \$50 million.

August 23, 1965

Business Council, formerly known as the Business Advisory Council. As you may know, this organization, which was once associated with the Department of Commerce but which is now independent, was formed for the purpose of advising the Federal Government on matters of broad public policy affecting the business community. The council is composed predominantly of men associated with private industry, and in all cases they are men of proven character, ability, and sense of public responsibility. The Business Council has been functioning successfully since 1933, and its influence upon important Government policy decisions has been great, and is even now felt to be expanding.

Without going too fully into the operations of the Business Council, we feel that an organization of this nature could best serve the travel industry—with all of its divergent interests—at least initially. It would offer the advantages of being advisory, it would reflect an industrywide point of view, it would serve as a listening post, it would furnish two-way communication with the Government, it would involve practically no capital outlay or organizational expense, it could—as the Business Council now does—appoint special committees to study and deal with specific problems as they arise, and—above all—we have very good reason to believe that if such a council is established and is composed of responsible representatives of the travel industry, it will be recognized by the Government.

In general, if modeled after the Business Council, the Travel Advisory Council would be constituted somewhat as follows:

1. Purposes: The Travel Advisory Council would be dedicated to serving the national interest and its primary objectives would be to submit to any branch or agency of Government—or to any recognized public body—a constructive point of view on matters of public policy affecting the travel industry; to respond to requests by any branch or agency of the Government for advice and assistance in carrying out their respective responsibilities; and to provide a medium for a better understanding of Government problems by the travel business.

2. Membership: The Travel Advisory Council shall consist of not more than 50 active members, chosen to be broadly representative from both a geographic as well as a functional point of view. There shall be no political qualifications for membership.

The active membership of the Travel Advisory Council shall change periodically so that the council may enjoy the benefits which accrue from the introduction of new personalities and fresh points of view.

All active members shall be invited to serve for a period of 1 year. They shall be selected by the executive committee.

3. Executive committee and officers: The executive committee of the council shall consist of 10 members elected by the council at its organizational meeting. A quorum of the executive committee shall consist of six members.

The council will elect a chairman and not more than two vice chairmen. The chairman will also be chairman of the executive committee.

If at some later time it is felt in the best interests of the industry to employ an executive secretary to devote his full time to Travel Advisory Council affairs, this position will be filled by the executive committee, which will also fix his compensation.

4. Appointment of committees: Since much of the work of the council will be done by special committees, the executive committee is empowered to appoint such committees and to name the chairmen thereof.

Where desirable, committees may have noncouncil members who are specifically qualified to bring information on matters under the committees' consideration.

5. Meetings: Meetings of the Travel Advisory Council shall be held at least twice a year or more often, at the discretion of the executive committee.

The executive committee shall meet from time to time as may be necessary and at any time at the call of the chairman.

6. Reports: Committee reports shall be submitted to the Travel Advisory Council for approval unless prior authority is given for a committee to deal directly with the Government agency or branch involved.

7. Council fund: The chairman of the council is authorized to solicit and collect a previously determined fund adequate to carry on the work of the council.

8. Amendments: This organizational structure may be amended or changed at any regular meeting by a majority vote of all the active members of the council.

Holiday has no wish to persuade the travel industry into organizing itself, or indeed, to take any other action. But, we wanted to present our findings to our friends in the industry for whatever value they may be. We are aware of the fact that many industry leaders are looking ahead in this direction, and that many feel some form of organization is necessary. Moreover, we would be agreeable to taking the initiative in calling together in Washington, or in any other more convenient location, the leaders of the travel industry for a symposium to discuss this issue, and related topics. If such a meeting should come about, we would seek to have on hand some top Government officials as well as a spokesman for the business council who could describe in detail the manner in which that organization operates.

Any council which may be established, such as that outlined here, should represent domestic travel interests as well as those promoting overseas travel, and its ultimate purpose must be far broader than just blocking the imposition of a penalty tax or promoting the "See the U.S.A." program. The council can best serve the interests of the entire travel market only if it provides a continuous two-way channel of communication between the industry and the Government. We genuinely feel that the travel industry is in a position to make great strides within the next few years, but we know that while there are enormous opportunities in this field, it is inevitable that there shall also be constant problems. We pledge our full assistance to the industry in dealing with both the opportunities and the problems.

Thank you for taking the time to review this matter. Perhaps you agree that its importance and urgency to your company and the travel industry at large require immediate attention. I would therefore appreciate your comments or reaction at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

GARTH HITE,

Vice President and Publisher.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there has come to my attention two excellent editorials from the Atlanta Constitution and the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin concerning the President's course of action in the war in Vietnam.

These editorials support the President's Vietnam policy, and make the point that our forces remain in Vietnam by invitation and that we are there to assist in turning back the tide of Communist aggression in southeast Asia, and that radical attacks upon this policy in effect gives aid and comfort to the enemy.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution
Aug. 14, 1965]

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SCOTCHES RUMOR—WE
REMAIN IN VIETNAM BY INVITATION

Both President Johnson and Henry Cabot Lodge, our Ambassador to Vietnam, have made special efforts to emphasize that the United States is participating in the war against the Vietcong only at the request of the Vietnamese Government.

Earlier, Ambassador Lodge had been quoted in a supposed leak from private committee hearings as vowing that the United States would stay in Vietnam with or without the invitation of the legitimate government.

If that had been a true statement of American policy, it would have represented a sharp shift of our long-standing ground rules and would seriously have weakened America's moral position in the war.

"I didn't say that, I'll tell you," Mr. Lodge said of the unsubstantiated report.

And the President declared: "The United States would never undertake the sacrifice these efforts require if its help were not wanted and requested."

Let us hope that the mischief done by the report of alleged testimony now is undone.

It is true that the United States has interests in Vietnam exclusive of protecting the Vietnamese Government. Vietnam is, as Korea was a decade and a half ago, the line drawn against Communist aggression. It is important that the tide be checked before all of southeast Asia is flooded.

But we are, after all, fighting on Vietnamese soil. To do so uninvited would not only increase the danger to our troops manifold, but it would well nigh destroy our moral position.

As long as we show the firmness of our commitment to protect Vietnam, and strive to help solve the social and political needs of the people as well as the military, the chances are very slim that we will be asked out.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin,
Aug. 11, 1965]

GIVING AID AND COMFORT

Teach-ins, public hearings, and grassroots rallies, designed to excite the public against American resistance to Communist aggression in southeast Asia, may be tolerated in the name of free speech. Even a Rutgers professor who said he would rejoice in a Vietcong victory (that is, in a defeat for the United States), is supposed to be merely expressing a permissible opinion, according to the governing body of his university.

Obstructive action is something quite different. Out in California, at Oakland, for 2 days running, demonstrators attempted to impede the passage of troop trains carrying men bound for the Pacific. In other places, young men have been counseled to burn, and some did burn, their draft cards. Declarations of conscience are circulated, and those signing them undertake to hamper the prosecution of military action in Vietnam in every possible way.

No nation involved in hostilities can permit actions which give aid and comfort to the enemy, unless all sense of the very definition of treason has been forgotten. Direct obstruction should be met by stern and prompt repression.

When the French were involved in Vietnam, after granting progressive independence to their former colony, the Communists in France laid a propaganda backfire on the homefront which was much more effective than the defeat at Dienbienphu (one lost battle) in bringing about the surrender. It is an object lesson worth recalling soberly before it is too late.

Innocently, local adults and their children have hundreds of piggy banks that are full of much needed coins. They may have forgotten where such savings have been stored. Why all this hoarding, this miserliness?

Because the government is taking the silver out of dimes and quarters, reducing it in 50 cents pieces and refusing to mint more silver dollars. They have the crazy idea that they are going to make some big profit out of holding the coins. But they fail to realize that buried money earns no interest.

It is said that one can get \$1.25 for a silver dollar today. But a dollar deposited in return for a time certificate can yearly earn 4½ cents. In 5 years, it will earn 25 cents.

But this is a very small part of the problem.

Money was made for use of the people just as streets were. Hoarding money is like blocking off a section of a street.

Hoarding change in Lovelock is already hurting. If the selfish trend continues, it will be a deadly hurt.

But hoarding goes further. It is affecting the gaming and tourist business. Lovelock, Pershing County, and the State of Nevada depend on these for a large part of their income. If you are hoarding, you are hurting them.

By hoarding you are showing lack of faith in America to survive. If you are afraid of inflation, how are you going to cash in on it with your dollars? Eventually, laws will be passed to head you off. And eventually, quarter, and half dollars will be replaced with paper money. If hoarders, and their likes keep up their practice.

We would like to see a movement started in Pershing County, and Lovelock in particular, in which a public list is signed, agreeing not to hoard, and pledging oneself to take every possible means of preventing hard cash leaving the community.

This would involve turning in hoardings, emptying piggy banks and arrangement with the local bank to cooperate.

We appeal to the local loyalty and the patriotism of Lovelock people to do their part in correcting this evil situation.

"We would publish free of charge such a list."

TRAVEL ADVISORY COUNCIL URGED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, recently Holiday magazine has undertaken an important initiative much needed in the field of U.S. travel, namely to unite all segments of the industry within a Travel Advisory Council patterned after the highly successful Business Council.

I believe that there is a great need for such a Travel Advisory Council to give the industry a spokesman and to provide an effective bridge between the industry and the Federal Government, and to advise the latter on matters of broad public policy.

On July 20 I introduced a bill, S. 2305, which, I believe, would put this Nation on the road toward becoming a premier travel Nation. I am pleased that Senators SCOTT, LONG of Missouri, McGEE, HARTKE, CANNON, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, PEARSON, BREWSTER, BIBLE, and CLARK have recognized the potential of this bill and are cosponsoring it. Senator Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, has recently assured me that early next session the committee will schedule a full dress review of U.S. tourist policies and at that time the committee will give S. 2305 full and careful consideration.

With an expanded U.S. Travel Service, an effective domestic travel program, a

closely coordinated U.S. Government travel effort; and a National Travel Resources Review Commission in being—which are provided for in S. 2305—and a Travel Advisory Council, patterned after the Business Council giving the industry a spokesman before Federal Government councils, the United States would have the appropriate means to transform this Nation into the first ranking travel Nation it could and should be.

I wish once again to commend Holiday magazine for undertaking to initiate the Travel Advisory Council and urge the U.S. travel industry to give this proposal its earnest and sympathetic consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter circulated among U.S. travel industry on this subject by Garth Hite, vice president and publisher of Holiday magazine be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLIDAY,
New York, N.Y.

Admittedly, this is a very long letter. It concerns, however, a subject that is very important to you and to us—the travel industry. I must ask your indulgence, then, to spend a little more time with this letter than with the usual correspondence.

The proposal seriously advanced earlier this year to President Johnson by the Federal Reserve Board and the Department of Treasury to correct the balance-of-payments deficit by imposing a \$100 penalty tax upon all Americans traveling outside the country was viewed by Holiday with considerable anxiety. While the proposal was discarded by the President, this decision is considered a temporary one to enable the President to determine whether or not the deficit can be erased by other means. In fact, officials of the Department of Commerce have said that as long as the balance-of-payments deficit remains critical—and they still consider it a crisis situation—the possibility of a penalty tax of some kind being imposed must be considered. Already passports issued to Americans in the first 3 months of 1965 have shot up nearly 13 percent over the total issued in the same period last year. This development has been noted with misgivings by some Government officials.

Immediately after the head tax proposal was offered, Holiday launched what eventually developed into a very thorough investigation of the travel industry and its relations (or more accurately its lack of them) with the Federal Government. We do not believe that undue criticism should be directed at the Government; the major fault—if it can be called that—lies within the travel industry as a whole in that it has failed to communicate with Government. Our primary goal was to determine how well organized the industry was to deal with what may have been a serious threat to overseas travel, but this later was broadened into a searching look at the industry's present ability to protect itself, not merely against the penalty tax threat, but against any other danger, now unforeseen, that may arise without warning in the months ahead. Equally important, we sought to learn how well, if at all, the travel industry had impressed the Government and the public with its importance to the national economy, and the need for encouraging rather than harassing an industry that is now the third largest in the Nation. We are well aware, of course, that other companies and groups—American Express, Pan American, Travel Agent magazine, Travel Weekly, ASTA, and Infoplan, among others—have done considerable prob-

ing of the problem and have compiled a great deal of information on this subject.

Thus results of Holiday's general inquiry, which was based upon interviews with Government officials concerned with travel matters as well as with executives of the various travel organizations, were predictable but dismaying. While all of the different groups within the industry were organized according to their immediate interests, no organization existed to speak for the industry as a whole or to unite it for common defense.

Stated briefly, these facts emerged:

FROM THE GOVERNMENT

An acknowledgment that there was no central, responsible source recognized by the Government to which it could turn for statistics covering the entire travel industry.

2. An expressed willingness to recognize and cooperate with a central organization which would represent the industry.

3. Widely varying and often conflicting data quoted by the Government in its statements on the balance-of-payments deficit, the value of travel to the national economy, and the indirect responsibility of tourism in enlarging certain sales and export figures. (Notably in the aircraft industry.)

4. A determination to reduce by persuasion, if by no other means, the overseas travel of U.S. citizens.

FROM THE INDUSTRY

1. A general feeling of anxiety growing from a realization that a large and powerful industry lacks the organization to protect its own welfare.

2. A universal feeling that the risks inherent in this situation are more likely to increase than decrease in the years ahead, since the established pattern of Government control is obviously an expanding one.

3. A general conviction that the travel industry has grown to the point where, aside from any Government threats, it would be in its own best interests to have the means of providing reliable statistics and information to the public.

Many other facts, not connected with spending or the economy, also were disclosed by these talks. Passport and custom policies, the tying-in of the President's beautification program with domestic travel, public investment in the expansion of our national park system, future scope of the U.S. Travel Service, and the difficulties faced by the White House in recruiting top travel executives for Government posts—all were discussed with the appropriate authorities and all reflected a generally unilateral point of view rather than one incorporating the views of both the Government and the industry.

Admittedly, the travel industry is composed of a number of businesses that are widely divergent—such as motels, railroads, gas stations, airlines, shiplines, resorts, and car rentals—yet the mobility of man is a common thread that links them together and provides each with a stake in the economic well-being of the entire industry. But because the industry is splintered and ranges so broadly, it is difficult to imagine a single organization that can serve all of its varied interests. In fact, the usual trade association concept would contain so many inevitable conflicts of interests, between types of carriers, between overseas and domestic travel, between regions, etc., that it would be totally unworkable.

The full potential of the travel industry is difficult to prophesy but it is conceivable that within 25 years it will be established as the world's largest industry. Long before this happens, and hopefully before some now unforeseen mishap occurs, the U.S. travel industry should erect some kind of organizational structure to advance its best interests. In studying examples of organizations created to work with the Federal Government, the one that seems most adaptable to the peculiarities of the travel industry is the

August 23, 1965

I think it is inappropriate to come in at this late hour and try to change the site without any provision for money to buy the site. The bill merely provides for a site in the vicinity of the Pennsylvania Avenue development program. It seems to me this is quite realistic. If it had been provided for originally and we had been able to get a site, it would be another matter, but a great amount of time, money, and effort have been expended on the development of the site.

Aside from that fact, I think it comes too late to try to change it now. It would destroy the present concept altogether.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Arkansas has commented on the pending Cultural Center site. As a member of the District of Columbia Committee, let me say that in view of the developments, I believe it is an excellent choice. It would be a great mistake to try to disrupt the program now by getting into controversy over location of the center. The program is coming along nicely.

As the Senator from Arkansas knows, it is expected that a substantial drive will be conducted to obtain private funds and contributions. Our citizens have been led to believe that the site has been agreed upon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Some \$15 million has been raised privately.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, the Senator is correct, but not only that, as we look at the situation in retrospect, and when we take into account the plans which are now in the blueprint stage for other developments in the District of Columbia, I believe that it is an excellent site.

This may be a sentimental argument on my part, but I believe it is a most appropriate site in view of the fact that President Kennedy's burial place is just across the river, with its everlasting torch aflame. Thus, this center will be among other shrines in the area, such as the Lincoln Memorial, the Jefferson Memorial, and other memorials. The Cultural Center is, after all, being built as a great memorial to our great President Kennedy, and is most appropriately located at the site which has been selected.

Accordingly, I sincerely hope that plans for completing the Center will proceed without any controversy being raised at this date over its location.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his comments. They are entirely appropriate.

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD CONCERNING A CHRONOLOGY PUBLISHED BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS ON THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] has today issued a press release entitled "Senator Dodd Charges Foreign Relations Publication on Dominican Crisis Slanted Against Administration."

The allegation is that the chronology quoted exclusively from press sources

critical of administration policy in the Dominican Republic. The remarks of the senior Senator from Connecticut included complaints that the chronology did not bear statements favorable to the position of the administration.

The facts are as follows:

First. The document to which the senior Senator refers was issued in early July for use of the committee in connection with its effort to learn in detail of developments in the Dominican Republic. It was compiled, as noted in the preface, from material "collected with the assistance of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the Department of State, and the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations." Because of shortage of time, the staff of the committee in compiling the chronology made extensive use of a research instrument to which it subscribes entitled "Deadline Data."

Second. The statement of the senior Senator from Connecticut leaves the impression that the administration views were not adequately presented in the chronology. Members should note, however, that the chronology and the accompanying printed material includes not only a number of documents issued by the Organization of American States, but six statements by President Johnson, and a number of statements by the Department of State and one by Ambassador Stevenson.

Third. I do wish to express my regret that it has not been possible for the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] to attend meetings of the Foreign Relations Committee on this subject. Much of the material to which he referred has been considered by the committee.

Fourth. Finally, I wish the RECORD to show that all of the witnesses which the committee heard at the sessions not attended by the Senator from Connecticut were administration witnesses, save one. We heard the testimony of Secretary of State Rusk, Under Secretary of State Mann, Deputy Secretary of Defense Vance, Ambassador Bennett, Admiral Raborn, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Assistant Secretary of State for American Republics Affairs Vaughn. The only non-Government witness called before the committee was the former Governor of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín.

Investigations of acts of the executive department by their very nature, as the Senator well knows, put the burden on the administration to prove that its actions were correct. I believe that a fair criticism of the committee might be that it put too much time and effort into the examination of Government witnesses, and not enough into examination of Government critics.

The committee has met on 13 different occasions, compiling some 760 pages of testimony. Most of the meetings have been 2 or 3 hours in length. The senior Senator from Connecticut attended one of these meetings, and a search of the committee records indicates that he has not seen fit to consult the transcripts of those hearings.

FURTHER AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Aug. 18, 1965, pp. 20132-20135, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, today, there came to my attention a document entitled "Why Vietnam," which includes some historical documents—letters written by President Kennedy and President Eisenhower, and statements made by President Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk. It is a most informative document and will be helpful to citizens who wish to study step by step the nature and extent of our involvement in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent to have this document printed in the RECORD for the information of all Senators.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY VIETNAM FOREWORD

MY FELLOW AMERICANS: Once again in man's age-old struggle for a better life and a world of peace, the wisdom, courage, and compassion of the American people are being put to the test. This is the meaning of the tragic conflict in Vietnam.

In meeting the present challenge, it is essential that our people seek understanding, and that our leaders speak with candor.

I have therefore directed that this report to the American people be compiled and widely distributed. In its pages you will find statements on Vietnam by three leaders of your Government—by your President, your Secretary of State, and your Secretary of Defense.

These statements were prepared for different audiences, and they reflect the differing responsibilities of each speaker. The congressional testimony has been edited to avoid undue repetition and to incorporate the sense of the discussions that ensued.

Together, they construct a clear definition of America's role in the Vietnam conflict: the dangers and hopes that Vietnam holds for all free men, the fullness and limits of our national objectives in a war we did not seek, the constant effort on our part to bring this war we do not desire to a quick and honorable end.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AUGUST 20, 1965.

THE ROOTS OF COMMITMENT

In the historic documents that follow, two American Presidents define and affirm

August 23, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20615

farmland in the flood plain area from the reservoir to the mouth of Wolf Creek. Operating in conjunction with Fort Supply Reservoir, it would provide protection to approximately 29,000 additional acres of farmland from the mouth of Wolf Creek to the upper limits of Canton Reservoir. Operating in conjunction with Canton Reservoir, Optima would aid in flood protection to approximately 68,000 additional acres of farmland from Canton Reservoir to Oklahoma City.

In addition to these impressive flood control benefits, Optima Reservoir will also provide a dependable yield of 10 million gallons of water per day for water supply. The cities of Guymon and Hardesty, Okla., and the city of Goodwell, Panhandle A. & M. College, have adopted resolutions requesting this water for their municipal and industrial uses. The resolutions provide assurances that the costs allocated to water supply will be repaid to the Federal Government as required by the Water Supply Act of 1958.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, keeping in mind the present investment of over half a million dollars of Federal funds, plus the vast benefits which the Optima Reservoir will provide the people of Oklahoma, through the prevention of disastrous floods, the availability of water for recreation, and for domestic reserves to meet the demands of an ever-increasing population, and finally the protection afforded the valuable, productive farmlands of the North Canadian Valley, I respectfully request that the committee include in the fiscal year 1966 appropriations the \$1,200,000 needed to initiate construction on the Optima project.

With these three exceptions, I will stand in support of the President's budget requests.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point to the Arkansas River navigation project which is of vital interest to the people of Arkansas and Oklahoma. The President's budget asks for \$136,300,000 for this project as follows:

Project:	Amount
Arkansas River and tributaries (bank stabilization)-----	\$14, 700, 000
Arkansas River and tributaries (navigation locks and dams)-----	79, 000, 000
Dardanelle lock and dam-----	1, 700, 000
Ozark lock and dam-----	9, 000, 000
Keystone Reservoir-----	5, 500, 000
Robert S. Kerr lock and dam-----	18, 100, 000
Webbers Falls lock and dam-----	8, 300, 000
Total-----	136, 300, 000

Mr. Chairman, this budget request will keep the project on schedule for completion in 1970, and I would like to express my appreciation for the full cooperation which we have had from the President, this committee, the Congress, and the Corps of Engineers in continually keeping this project on schedule.

Your consideration of my requests is appreciated.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute to state to the Senator from Louisiana that I am certainly glad the country has had the services of the Senator from Louisiana. He serves with great distinction, but at the same time I would say he should have been a judge, for I do not know of anyone who carries out his public services with a finer judicial temperament than does the Senator from Louisiana in handling the public works appropriations and items before his subcommittee each year.

It would certainly be unappreciative

of me as a Senator from Oregon if I did not take just a minute, in behalf of the people of my State, to express our thanks to the Senator from Louisiana for his impartiality.

That does not mean that certain groups have always been pleased in instances in which certain groups have felt they should have obtained some projects, but I have said to them, when they have expressed their disappointment at not getting what they wanted, that they are indebted and the State is indebted to the Senator from Louisiana for his impartiality and fairness and his insistence that a group come in and establish its case on its merits.

The Senator knows that in the many years we have served together in the Senate I have never asked for anything except on the basis of the facts. He has weighed them carefully. This year he has demonstrated again his judicial temperament. That is why we place so much trust and faith in his impartiality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 9220) was passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interoceanic Canal Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJUSTMENTS IN ANNUITIES UNDER THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of calendar No. 614, H.R. 4170.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 614, H.R. 4170, to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration—

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator object?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe that this bill should go over.

Mr. INOUE. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

FURTHER AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Arkansas submit the conference report?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I intend to call up the conference report on the amendment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, H.R. 7750, and ask for its immediate consideration.

I have one or two other items I would like to refer to while the conference report is being obtained.

KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a few days ago Representative WIDNALL introduced a bill in the House of Representatives which requires the relocation of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

I have a memorandum on that subject from Roger L. Stevens, who is the Special Assistant to the White House on the Arts, and is Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Kennedy Center. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HONORABLE WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

Concerning your memorandum which I received on August 16 about the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. I will be glad to present all your points to the trustees at their next meeting.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that the board of trustees consists of a very prominent group of Americans who have given both time and money to the Center. They are a group that is outstanding in the fields of business, government and the performing arts. I am sure they will give the points raised every consideration.

ROGER L. STEVENS,
Special Assistant on the Arts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I only wish to add that this matter has been pending a long time in Congress. I introduced the original bill to provide for a site for a center back in 1957. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I had a long controversy as to where it should be located. I tried to get it located on the Mall near the Smithsonian Institution. I found that the Air Museum had preempted the ground. I tried all over the city. This was the only site to be obtained.

August 23, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20617

the commitment of the United States to the people of South Vietnam.

In letters to Prime Minister Churchill in 1954 and to President Diem in 1954 and 1960, President Eisenhower describes the issues at stake and pledges United States assistance to South Vietnam's resistance to subversion and aggression.

And in December 1961 President Kennedy reaffirms that pledge.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTER FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO PRIME MINISTER CHURCHILL, APRIL 4, 1954

(From Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Mandate for Change, 1963-66," New York, 1963)

DEAR WINSTON: I am sure * * * you are following with the deepest interest and anxiety the daily reports of the gallant fight being put up by the French at Dien Bien Phu. Today, the situation there does not seem hopeless.

But regardless of the outcome of this particular battle, I fear that the French cannot alone see the thing through, this despite the very substantial assistance in money and materiel that we are giving them. It is no solution simply to urge the French to intensify their efforts. And if they do not see it through and Indochina passes into the hands of the Communists the ultimate effect on our and your global strategic position with the consequent shift in the power ratios throughout Asia and the Pacific could be disastrous and, I know, unacceptable to you and me. * * * This has led us to the hard conclusion that the situation in southeast Asia requires us urgently to take serious and far-reaching decisions.

Geneva is less than 4 weeks away. There the possibility of the Communists driving a wedge between us will, given the state of mind in France, be infinitely greater than at Berlin. I can understand the very natural desire of the French to seek an end to this war which has been bleeding them for 8 years. But our painstaking search for a way out of the impasse has reluctantly forced us to the conclusion that there is no negotiated solution of the Indochina problem which in its essence would not be either a face-saving device to cover a French surrender or a face-saving device to cover a Communist retirement. The first alternative is too serious in its broad strategic implications for us and for you to be acceptable. * * *

Somewhat we must contrive to bring about the second alternative. The preliminary lines of our thinking were sketched out by Foster [Dulles] in his speech last Monday night when he said that under the conditions of today the imposition on southeast Asia of the political system of Communist Russia and its Chinese Communist ally, by whatever means, would be a grave threat to the whole free community, and that in our view this possibility should now be met by united action and not passively accepted. * * *

I believe that the best way to put teeth in this concept and to bring greater moral and material resources to the support of the French effort is through the establishment of a new, ad hoc grouping or coalition composed of nations which have a vital concern in the checking of Communist expansion in the area. I have in mind, in addition to our two countries, France, the Associated States, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand and the Philippines. The U.S. Government would expect to play its full part in such a coalition. * * *

The important thing is that the coalition must be strong and it must be willing to join the fight if necessary. I do not envisage the need of any appreciable ground forces on your or our part. * * *

If I may refer again to history; we failed to halt Hirohito, Mussolini, and Hitler by not acting in unity and in time. That marked the beginning of many years of stark tragedy

and desperate peril. May it not be that our nations have learned something from that lesson? * * *

With warm regard,

IKE.

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO PRESIDENT DIEM, OCTOBER 1, 1954

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have been following with great interest the course of developments in Vietnam, particularly since the conclusion of the conference at Geneva. The implications of the agreement concerning Vietnam have caused grave concern regarding the future of a country temporarily divided by an artificial military grouping, weakened by a long and exhausting war and faced with enemies without and by their subversive collaborators within.

Your recent requests for aid to assist in the formidable project of the movement of several hundred thousand loyal Vietnamese citizens away from areas which are passing under a de facto rule and political ideology which they abhor, are being fulfilled. I am glad that the United States is able to assist in this humanitarian effort.

We have been exploring ways and means to permit our aid to Vietnam to be more effective and to make a greater contribution to the welfare and stability of the Government of Vietnam. I am, accordingly, instructing the American Ambassador to Vietnam to examine with you in your capacity as Chief of Government, how an intelligent program of American aid given directly to your government can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial, provided that your government is prepared to give assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid were supplied.

The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. The Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms. It hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government. Such a government would, I hope, be so responsive to the nationalist aspirations of its people, so enlightened in purpose and effective in performance, that it will be respected both at home and abroad and discourage any who might wish to impose a foreign ideology on your free people.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO PRESIDENT DIEM, OCTOBER 26, 1960

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My countrymen and I are proud to convey our good wishes to you and to the citizens of Vietnam on the fifth anniversary of the birth of the Republic of Vietnam.

We have watched the courage and daring with which you and the Vietnamese people attained independence in a situation so perilous that many thought it hopeless. We have admired the rapidity with which chaos yielded to order and progress replaced despair.

During the years of your independence it has been refreshing for us to observe how clearly the Government and the citizens of Vietnam have faced the fact that the greatest danger to their independence was communism. You and your countrymen have used your strength well in accepting the double challenge of building your country and resisting Communist imperialism. In five short years since the founding of the Republic, the Vietnamese people have developed their country in almost every sector. I was particularly impressed by one example. I am informed that last year over 1,200,000

Vietnamese children were able to go to elementary school; three times as many as were enrolled 5 years earlier. This is certainly a heartening development for Vietnam's future. At the same time Vietnam's ability to defend itself from the Communists has grown immeasurably since its successful struggle to become an independent republic.

Vietnam's very success as well as its potential wealth and its strategic location have led the Communists of Hanoi, goaded by the bitterness of their failure to enslave all Vietnam, to use increasing violence in their attempts to destroy your country's freedom.

This grave threat, added to the strains and fatigues of the long struggle to achieve and strengthen independence, must be a burden that would cause moments of tension and concern in almost any human heart. Yet from long observation I sense how deeply the Vietnamese value their country's independence and strength and I know how well you used your boldness when you led your countrymen in winning it. I also know that your determination has been a vital factor in guarding that independence while steadily advancing the economic development of your country. I am confident that these same qualities of determination and boldness will meet the renewed threat as well as the needs and desires of your countrymen for further progress on all fronts.

Although the main responsibility for guarding that independence will always, as it has in the past, belong to the Vietnamese people and their government, I want to assure you that for so long as our strength can be useful, the United States will continue to assist Vietnam in the difficult yet hopeful struggle ahead.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT KENNEDY TO PRESIDENT DIEM, DECEMBER 14, 1961

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have received your recent letter in which you described so cogently the dangerous condition caused by North Vietnam's efforts to take over your country. The situation in your embattled country is well known to me and to the American people. We have been deeply disturbed by the assault on your country. Our indignation has mounted as the deliberate savagery of the Communist program of assassination, kidnapping, and wanton violence became clear.

Your letter underlines what our own information has convincingly shown—that the campaign of force and terror now being waged against your people and your Government is supported and directed from the outside by the authorities at Hanoi. They have thus violated the provisions of the Geneva accords designed to insure peace in Vietnam and to which they bound themselves in 1954.

At that time, the United States, although not a party to the accords, declared that it "would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security." We continue to maintain that view.

In accordance with that declaration, and in response to your request, we are prepared to help the Republic of Vietnam to protect its people and to preserve its independence. We shall promptly increase our assistance to your defense effort as well as help relieve the destruction of the floods which you describe. I have already given the orders to get these programs underway.

The United States, like the Republic of Vietnam, remains devoted to the cause of peace and our primary purpose is to help your people maintain their independence. If the Communist authorities in North Vietnam will stop their campaign to destroy the Republic of Vietnam, the measures we are taking to assist your defense efforts will no

longer be necessary. We shall seek to persuade the Communists to give up their attempts of force and subversion. In any case, we are confident that the Vietnamese people will preserve their independence and gain the peace and prosperity for which they have sought so hard and so long.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

TOWARD PEACE WITH HONOR

(Press conference statement by the President, the White House, July 28, 1965)

Not long ago I received a letter from a woman in the Midwest. She wrote:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In my humble way I am writing to you about the crisis in Vietnam. I have a son who is now in Vietnam. My husband served in World War II. Our country was at war, but now, this time, it is just something I don't understand. Why?"

I have tried to answer that question a dozen times and more in practically every State in this Union. I discussed it fully in Baltimore in April, in Washington in May, in San Francisco in June. Let me again, now, discuss it here in the East Room of the White House.

Why must young Americans, born into a land exultant with hope and golden with promise, toil and suffer and sometimes die in such a remote and distant place?

The answer, like the war itself, is not an easy one. But it echoes clearly from the painful lessons of half a century. Three times in my lifetime, in two world wars and in Korea, Americans have gone to far lands to fight for freedom. We have learned at a terrible and brutal cost that retreat does not bring safety, and weakness does not bring peace.

The nature of the war

It is this lesson that has brought us to Vietnam. This is a different kind of war. There are no marching armies or solemn declarations. Some citizens of South Vietnam, at times with understandable grievances, have joined in the attack on their own government. But we must not let this mask the central fact that this is really war. It is guided by North Vietnam and spurred by Communist China. Its goal is to conquer the South, to defeat American power, and to extend the Asiatic dominion of communism.

The stakes in Vietnam

And there are great stakes in the balance. Most of the non-Communist nations of Asia cannot, by themselves and alone, resist the growing might and grasping ambition of Asian communism. Our power, therefore, is a vital shield. If we are driven from the field in Vietnam, then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in American promise, or in American protection. In each land the forces of independence would be considerably weakened. And an Asia so threatened by Communist domination would imperil the security of the United States itself.

We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else.

Nor would surrender in Vietnam bring peace. We learned from Hitler at Munich that success only feeds the appetite of aggression. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another, bringing with it perhaps even larger and crueler conflict.

Moreover, we are in Vietnam to fulfill one of the most solemn pledges of the American Nation. Three Presidents—President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and your present President—over 11 years, have committed themselves and have promised to help defend this small and valiant nation.

Strengthened by that promise, the people of South Vietnam have fought for many long years. Thousands of them have died. Thousands more have been crippled and scarred by war. We cannot now dishonor our word or abandon our commitment or leave those who believed us and who trusted us to the terror and repression and murder that would follow.

This, then, my fellow Americans, is why we are in Vietnam.

Increased effort to halt aggression

What are our goals in that war-stained land?

First: We intend to convince the Communists that we cannot be defeated by force of arms or by superior power. They are not easily convinced. In recent months they have greatly increased their fighting forces, their attacks, and the number of incidents. I have asked the commanding general, General Westmoreland, what more he needs to meet this mounting aggression. He has told me. We will meet his needs.

I have today ordered to Vietnam the Air Mobile Division and certain other forces which will raise our fighting strength from 75,000 to 125,000 men almost immediately. Additional forces will be needed later, and they will be sent as requested. This will make it necessary to increase our active fighting forces by raising the monthly draft call from 17,000 over a period of time, to 35,000 per month, and stepping up our campaign for voluntary enlistments.

After this past week of deliberations, I have concluded that it is not essential to order Reserve units into service now. If that necessity should later be indicated, I will give the matter most careful consideration. And I will give the country adequate notice before taking such action, but only after full preparations.

We have also discussed with the Government of South Vietnam lately the steps that they will take to substantially increase their own effort—both on the battlefield and toward reform and progress in the villages. Ambassador Lodge is now formulating a new program to be tested upon his return to that area.

I have directed Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara to be available immediately to the Congress to review with the appropriate congressional committees our plan in these areas. I have asked them to be available to answer the questions of any Member of Congress.

Secretary McNamara, in addition, will ask the Senate Appropriations Committee to add a limited amount to present legislation to help meet part of this new cost until a supplemental measure is ready and hearings can be held when the Congress assembles in January.

In the meantime, we will use the authority contained in the present Defense appropriations bill now to transfer funds, in addition to the additional money that we will request.

These steps, like our actions in the past, are carefully measured to do what must be done to bring an end to aggression and a peaceful settlement. We do not want an expanding struggle with consequences that no one can foresee. Nor will we bluster or bully or flaunt our power.

But we will not surrender. And we will not retreat.

For behind our American pledge lies the determination and resources of all of the American Nation.

Toward a peaceful solution

Second, once the Communists know, as we know, that a violent solution is impossible, then a peaceful solution is inevitable. We are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table. I have stated publicly, and many times, America's willingness to begin unconditional discussions with any government at any place at any time. Fifteen efforts have been made to start these discussions, with the help of 40 nations throughout the world. But there has been no answer.

But we are going to continue to persist, if persist we must, until death and desolation have led to the same conference table where others could now join us at a much smaller cost.

I have spoken many times of our objectives in Vietnam. So has the Government of South Vietnam. Hanoi has set forth its own proposal. We are ready to discuss their proposals and our proposals and any proposals of any government whose people may be affected. For we fear the meeting room no more than we fear the battlefield.

The United Nations

In this pursuit we welcome, and we ask for, the concern and the assistance of any nation and all nations. If the United Nations and its officials—or any one of its 114 members—can, by deed or word, private initiative or public action, bring us nearer an honorable peace, then they will have the support and the gratitude of the United States of America.

I have directed Ambassador Goldberg to go to New York today and to present immediately to Secretary-General U Thant a letter from me requesting that all of the resources, energy, and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and to bring peace in Vietnam. I made a similar request at San Francisco a few weeks ago.

Free choice for Vietnam

We do not seek the destruction of any government, nor do we covet a foot of any territory. But we insist, and we will always insist, that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the South, or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision. And they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it.

This was the purpose of the 1954 agreements which the Communists have now cruelly shattered. If the machinery of those agreements was tragically weak, its purposes still guide our action.

As battle rages, we will continue as best we can to help the good people of South Vietnam enrich the condition of their life—to feed the hungry, to tend the sick—teach the young, shelter the homeless, and help the farmer to increase his crops, and the worker to find a job.

Progress in human welfare

It is an ancient, but still terrible, irony that while many leaders of men create division in pursuit of grand ambitions, the children of man are united in the simple elusive desire for a life of fruitful and rewarding toil.

As I said at Johns Hopkins in Baltimore, I hope that one day we can help all the people of Asia toward that desire. Eugene Black has made great progress since my appearance in Baltimore in that direction, not as the price of peace—for we are ready always to bear a more painful cost—but rather as a part of our obligations of justice toward our fellow man.

The difficulty of decision

Let me also add a personal note. I do not find it easy to send the flower of our youth, our finest young men, into battle. I have spoken to you today of the divisions and the forces and the battalions and the units. But I know them all, every one. I have seen them in a thousand streets, in a hundred towns, in every State in this Union—working and laughing, building, and filled with hope and life. I think that I know, too, how their mothers weep and how their families sorrow. This is the most agonizing and the most painful duty of your President.

A nation which builds

There is something else, too. When I was young, poverty was so common that we didn't know it had a name. Education was something you had to fight for. And water was life itself. I have now been in public life 35 years, more than three decades, and in each of those 35 years I have seen good men,

August 23, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20619

and wise leaders, struggle to bring the blessings of this land to all of our people. Now I am the President. It is now my opportunity to help every child get an education, to help every Negro and every American citizen have an equal opportunity, to help every family get a decent home and to help bring healing to the sick and dignity to the old.

As I have said before, that is what I have lived for. That is what I have wanted all my life. And I do not want to see all those hopes and all those dreams of so many people for so many years now drowned in the wasteful ravages of war. I am going to do all I can to see that that never happens.

But I also know, as a realistic public servant, that as long as there are men who hate and destroy we must have the courage to resist, or we will see it all, all that we have built, all that we hope to build, all of our dreams for freedom—all swept away on the flood of conquest.

So this too shall not happen; we will stand in Vietnam.

THE TASKS OF DIPLOMACY

(Statement by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, August 3, 1965)

As the President has said, "there are great stakes in the balance" in Vietnam today.

Let us be clear about those stakes. With its archipelagos, southeast Asia contains rich natural resources and some 200 million people. Geographically, it has great strategic importance—it dominates the gateway between the Pacific and Indian Oceans and flanks the Indian subcontinent on one side, and Australia and New Zealand on the other. The loss of southeast Asia to the Communists would constitute a serious shift in the balance of power against the interests of the free world. And the loss of South Vietnam would make the defense of the rest of southeast Asia much more costly and difficult. That is why the SEATO Council has said that the defeat of the aggression against South Vietnam is "essential" to the security of southeast Asia.

But much more is at stake than preserving the independence of the peoples of southeast Asia and preventing the vast resources of that area from being swallowed by those hostile to freedom.

The test

The war in Vietnam is a test of a technique of aggression: what the Communists, in their upside-down language, call wars of national liberation. They use the term to describe any effort by Communists, short of large-scale war, to destroy by force any non-Communist government. Thus the leaders of the Communist terrorists in such an independent democracy as Venezuela are described as leaders of a fight for "national liberation." And a recent editorial in Pravda said that "the upsurge of the national liberation movement in Latin American countries has been to a great extent a result of the activities of Communist Parties."

Communist leaders know, as the rest of the world knows, that thermonuclear war would be ruinous. They know that large-scale invasions, such as that launched in Korea 15 years ago, would bring great risks and heavy penalties. So, they have resorted to semi-concealed aggression through the infiltration of arms and trained military personnel across national frontiers. And the Asian Communists themselves regard the war in Vietnam as a critical test of that technique. Recently General Giap, leader of North Vietnam's army said:

"If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated everywhere in the world."

In southeast Asia, the Communists already have publicly designated Thailand as the next target. And if the aggression

against South Vietnam were permitted to succeed, the forces of militant communism everywhere would be vastly heartened and we could expect to see a series of so-called wars of liberation in Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

International law does not restrict internal revolution. But it does restrict what third powers may lawfully do in sending arms and men to bring about insurrection. What North Vietnam is doing in South Vietnam flouts not only the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 but general international law.

The assault on the Republic of Vietnam is, beyond question, an aggression. It was organized and has been directed by North Vietnam, with the backing of Communist China. The cadres of guerrilla fighters, saboteurs, and assassins who form the backbone of the Vietcong were specially trained in the North. Initially, many of them were men of South Vietnamese birth who had fought with the Viet Minh against the French and gone North in their military units after Vietnam was divided in 1954. But that reservoir was gradually exhausted. During 1964 and since, most of the military men infiltrated from the North have been natives of North Vietnam. And near the end of last year they began to include complete units of the regular North Vietnamese army. In addition to trained men and political and military direction, the North has supplied arms and ammunition in increasing quantities—in considerable part of Chinese manufacture.

Between 1959 and the end of 1964, 40,000 trained military personnel came down from the North into South Vietnam, by conservative estimate. More have come this year. Had all these crossed the line at once—as the North Koreans did in invading South Korea 15 years ago—nobody in the free world could have doubted that the assault on Vietnam was an aggression. That the dividing line between North and South Vietnam was intended to be temporary does not make the attack any less of an aggression. The dividing line in Korea also was intended to be temporary.

If there is ever to be peace in this world, aggression must cease. We as a Nation are committed to peace and the rule of law. We recognize also the harsh reality that our security is involved.

We are committed to oppose aggression not only through the United Nations Charter but through many defensive alliances. We have 42 allies, not counting the Republic of Vietnam. And many other nations know that their security depends upon us. Our power and our readiness to use it to assist others to resist aggression, the integrity of our commitment, these are the bulwarks of peace in the world.

If we were to fail in Vietnam, serious consequences would ensue. Our adversaries would be encouraged to take greater risks elsewhere. At the same time, the confidence which our allies and other free nations now have in our commitments would be seriously impaired.

The commitment

Let us be clear about our commitment in Vietnam.

It began with the Southeast Asia Treaty, which was negotiated and signed after the Geneva agreements and the cease-fire in Indochina in 1954 and was approved by the U.S. Senate by a vote of 82 to 1 in February 1955. That treaty protects against Communist aggression not only its members but any of the three non-Communist states growing out of former French Indochina which asks for protection.

Late in 1954 President Eisenhower, with bipartisan support, decided to extend aid to South Vietnam, both economic aid and aid in training its armed forces. His purpose, as he said, was to "assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining

a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means."

Vietnam became a republic in 1955, was recognized as an independent nation by 36 nations initially, and is so recognized by more than 50 today.

Beginning in 1955, the Congress has each year approved overall economic and military assistance programs in which the continuation of major aid to South Vietnam has been specifically considered.

During the next 5 years, South Vietnam made remarkable economic and social progress—what some observers described as a "miracle."

Nearly a million refugees from the north were settled. These were the stouthearted people of whom the late Dr. Tom Dooley wrote so eloquently in his first book, "Deliver Us From Evil," and who led him to devote the rest of his all-too-brief life to helping the people of Vietnam and Laos.

A land-reform program was launched. A comprehensive system of agricultural credit was set up. Thousands of new schools and more than 3,500 village health stations were built. Rail transportation was restored and roads were repaired and improved. South Vietnam not only fed itself but resumed rice exports. Production of rubber and sugar rose sharply. New industries were started. Per capita income rose by 20 percent.

By contrast, North Vietnam suffered a drop of 10 percent in food production and dis-appointments in industrial production.

In 1954, Hanoi almost certainly had expected to take over South Vietnam within a few years. But by 1959 its hopes had withered and the south was far outstripping the heralded "Communist paradise." These almost certainly were the factors which led Hanoi to organize and launch the assault on the south.

I beg leave to quote from a statement I made at a press conference on May 4, 1961:

"Since late in 1959 organized Communist activity in the form of guerrilla raids against army and security units of the Government of Vietnam, terrorist acts against local officials and civilians, and other subversive activities in the Republic of Vietnam have increased to levels unprecedented since the Geneva agreements of 1954. During this period the organized armed strength of the Vietcong, the Communist apparatus operating in the Republic of Vietnam, has grown from about 3,000 to over 12,000 personnel. This armed strength has been supplemented by an increase in the numbers of political and propaganda agents in the area.

"During 1960 alone, Communist armed units and terrorists assassinated or kidnaped over 3,000 local officials, military personnel, and civilians. Their activities took the form of armed attacks against isolated garrisons, attacks on newly established townships, ambushes on roads and canals, destruction of bridges, and well-planned sabotage against public works and communication lines. Because of Communist guerrilla activity 200 elementary schools had to be closed at various times, affecting over 25,000 students and 800 teachers.

"This upsurge of Communist guerrilla activity apparently stemmed from a decision made in May 1959 by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of North Vietnam which called for the reunification of Vietnam by all 'appropriate means.' In July of the same year the Central Committee was reorganized and charged with intelligence duties and the liberation of South Vietnam. In retrospect this decision to step up guerrilla activity was made to reverse the remarkable success which the Government of the Republic of Vietnam under President Ngo Dinh Diem had achieved in consolidating its political position and in attaining significant economic recovery in the 5 years between 1954 and 1959.

20620

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 23, 1965

"Remarkably coincidental with the renewed Communist activity in Laos, the Communist Party of North Vietnam at its Third Congress on September 10, 1960, adopted a resolution which declared that the Vietnamese revolution has as a major strategic task the liberation of the South from the 'rule of U.S. imperialists and their henchmen.' This resolution called for the direct overthrow of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam."

Next door to South Vietnam, Laos was threatened by a similar Communist assault. The active agent of attack on both was Communist North Vietnam, with the backing of Peiping and Moscow. In the case of Laos, we were able to negotiate an agreement in 1962 that it should be neutral and that all foreign military personnel should be withdrawn. We complied with that agreement. But North Vietnam never did. In gross violation of its pledge, it left armed units in Laos and continued to use Laos as a corridor to infiltrate arms and trained men into South Vietnam.

There was no new agreement, even on paper, on Vietnam. Late in 1961, President Kennedy therefore increased our assistance to the Republic of Vietnam. During that year, the infiltration of arms and military personnel from the North continued to increase. To cope with that escalation, President Kennedy decided to send more American military personnel—to assist with logistics and transportation and communications as well as with training and as advisers to South Vietnamese forces in the field. Likewise, we expanded our economic assistance and technical advice, particularly with a view to improving living conditions in the villages.

During 1962 and 1963, Hanoi continued to increase its assistance to the Vietcong. In response, President Kennedy and later President Johnson increased our aid.

Hanoi kept on escalating the war throughout 1964. And the Vietcong intensified its drafting and training of men in the areas it controls.

Last August, you will recall, North Vietnamese forces attacked American destroyers in international waters. That attack was met by appropriate air response against North Vietnamese naval installations. And Congress, by a combined vote of 504 to 2, passed a resolution expressing its support for actions by the Executive "including the use of armed force" to meet aggression in southeast Asia, including specifically aggression against South Vietnam. The resolution and the congressional debate specifically envisaged that, subject to continuing congressional consultation, the Armed Forces of the United States might be committed in the defense of South Vietnam in any way that seemed necessary, including employment in combat.

In summary, our commitment in Vietnam has been set forth in the Southeast Asia Treaty, which was almost unanimously approved by the U.S. Senate; the pledges made with bipartisan support by three successive Presidents of the United States; the assistance programs approved annually, beginning in 1955, by bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress; the declarations which we joined our SEATO and ANZUS allies in making at their Ministerial Council Meetings in 1964 and 1965; the joint congressional resolution of August 1964, which was approved by a combined vote of 504 to 2.

Our commitment is to assist the Government and people of South Vietnam to repel this aggression, thus preserving their freedom. This commitment is to the South Vietnamese as a nation and people. It has continued through various changes of government, just as our commitments to our NATO allies remain unaltered by changes in government.

Continued escalation of the aggression by the other side has required continued

strengthening of the military defenses of South Vietnam. Whether still more American military personnel will be needed will depend on events, especially on whether the other side continues to escalate the aggression. As the President has made plain, we will provide the South Vietnamese with whatever assistance may be necessary to ensure that the aggression against them is effectively repelled—that is, to make good on our commitment.

The pursuit of a peaceful settlement

As President Johnson and his predecessors have repeatedly emphasized, our objective in southeast Asia is peace—a peace in which the various peoples of the area can manage their own affairs in their own ways and address themselves to economic and social progress.

We seek no bases or special position for the United States. We do not seek to destroy or overturn the Communist regimes in Hanoi and Peiping. We ask only that they cease their aggressions, that they leave their neighbors alone.

Repeatedly, we and others have sought to achieve a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam.

We have had many talks with the Soviet authorities over a period of more than 4 years. But their influence in Hanoi appears to be limited. Recently, when approached, their response has been, in substance: "You have come to the wrong address—nobody has authorized us to negotiate. Talk to Hanoi."

We have had a long series of talks with the Chinese Communists in Warsaw. Although Peiping is more cautious in action than in word, it is unbending in its hostility to us and plainly opposed to any negotiated settlement in Vietnam.

There have been repeated contacts with Hanoi. Many channels are open. And many have volunteered to use them. But so far there has been no indication that Hanoi is seriously interested in peace on any terms except those which would assure a Communist takeover of South Vietnam.

We and others have sought to open the way for conferences on the neighboring states of Laos and Cambodia, where progress toward peace might be reflected in Vietnam. These approaches have been blocked by Hanoi and Peiping.

The United Kingdom, as cochairman of the Geneva conferences, has repeatedly sought a path to a settlement—first by working toward a new Geneva Conference, then by a visit by a senior British statesman. Both efforts were blocked by the Communists—and neither Hanoi nor Peiping would even receive the senior British statesman.

In April, President Johnson offered unconditional discussions with the governments concerned. Hanoi and Peiping called this offer a "hoax."

Seventeen nonaligned nations appealed for a peaceful solution, by negotiations without preconditions. We accepted the proposal. Hanoi and Red China rejected it with scorn, calling some of its authors "monsters and freaks."

The President of India made a constructive proposal for an end to hostilities and an Afro-Asian patrol force. We welcomed this proposal with interest and hope. Hanoi and Peiping rejected it as a betrayal.

In May, the United States and South Vietnam suspended air attacks on North Vietnam. This action was made known to the other side to see if there would be a response in kind. But Hanoi denounced the pause as "a wornout trick" and Peiping denounced it as a "swindle." Some say the pause was not long enough. But we knew the negative reaction from the other side before we resumed. And we had paused previously for more than 4 years while thousands of armed men invaded the south and killed thousands of South Vietnamese, including women and children, and deliberately destroyed school-

houses and playgrounds and hospitals and health centers and other facilities that the South Vietnamese had built to improve their lives and give their children a chance for a better education and better health.

In late June, the Commonwealth Prime Ministers established a mission of four of their members to explore with all parties concerned the possibilities for a conference leading to a just and lasting peace. Hanoi and Peiping made it plain that they would not receive the mission.

Mr. Harold Davies, a member of the British Parliament, went to Hanoi with the approval of Prime Minister Wilson. But the high officials there would not even talk with him. And the lower-ranking officials who did talk with him made it clear that Hanoi was not yet interested in negotiations, that it was intent on a total victory in South Vietnam. As Prime Minister Wilson reported to the House of Commons, Mr. Davies met with a conviction among the North Vietnamese that their prospects of victory were too imminent for them to forsake the battlefield for the conference table.

We and others have made repeated efforts at discussions through the United Nations. In the Security Council, after the August attacks in the Gulf of Tonkin, we supported a Soviet proposal that the Government of North Vietnam be invited to come to the Security Council. But Hanoi refused.

In April, Secretary General U Thant considered visits to Hanoi and Peiping to explore the possibilities of peace. But both those Communist regimes made it plain that they did not regard the United Nations as competent to deal with that matter.

The President's San Francisco speech in June requested help from the United Nations' membership at large in getting peace talks started.

In late July the President sent our new Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur J. Goldberg, to New York with a letter to Secretary General U Thant requesting that all the resources, energy and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and to bring peace in Vietnam. The Secretary General has already accepted this assignment.

We sent a letter to the Security Council calling attention to the special responsibility in this regard of the Security Council and of the nations which happen to be members of the Council. We have considered from time to time placing the matter formally before the Security Council. But we have been advised by many nations—and by many individuals—who are trying to help to achieve a peaceful settlement that to force debate and a vote in the Security Council might tend to harden positions and make useful explorations and discussions even more difficult.

President Johnson has publicly invited any and all members of the United Nations to do all they can to bring about a peaceful settlement.

By these moves the United States has intended to engage the serious attention and efforts of the United Nations as an institution, and its members as signatories of its charter, in getting the Communists to talk rather than fight—while continuing with determination an increasing effort to demonstrate that Hanoi and the Vietcong cannot settle the issue on the battlefield.

We have not only placed the Vietnam issue before the United Nations, but believe that we have done so in the most constructive ways.

The conditions for peace

What are the essential conditions for peace in South Vietnam?

In late June, the Foreign Minister of South Vietnam set forth the fundamental principles of a "just and enduring peace." In summary, those principles are:

An end to aggression and subversion.

August 23, 1965

20621

Freedom for South Vietnam to choose and shape for itself its own destiny "in conformity with democratic principles and without any foreign interference from whatever sources."

As soon as aggression has ceased, the ending of the military measures now necessary by the Government of South Vietnam and the nations that have come to its aid to defend South Vietnam; and the removal of foreign military forces from South Vietnam.

And effective guarantees for the freedom of the people of South Vietnam.

We endorse those principles. In essence, they would constitute a return to the basic purpose of the Geneva accords of 1954. Whether they require reaffirmation of those accords or new agreements embodying these essential points, but with provision in either case for more effective international machinery and guarantees, could be determined in discussions and negotiations.

Once the basic points set forth by South Vietnam's Foreign Minister were achieved, future relations between North Vietnam and South Vietnam could be worked out by peaceful means. And this would include the question of a free decision by the people of North and South Vietnam on the matter of reunification.

When the aggression has ceased and the freedom of South Vietnam is assured by other means, we will withdraw our forces. Three Presidents of the United States have said many times that we want no permanent bases and no special position there. Our military forces are there because of the North Vietnamese aggression against South Vietnam and for no other reason. When the men and arms infiltrated by the North are withdrawn and Hanoi ceases its support and guidance of the war in the South, whatever remains in the form of indigenous dissent is a matter for the South Vietnamese themselves. As for South Vietnamese fighting in the Vietcong or under its control or influence, they must in time be integrated into their national society. But that is a process which must be brought about by the people of South Vietnam, not by foreign diplomats.

Apart from the search for a solution in Vietnam itself, the U.S. Government has hoped that discussions could be held on the problems concerning Cambodia and Laos. We supported the proposal of Prince Sihanouk for a conference on Cambodia, to be attended by the governments that participated in the 1954 conference, and noted the joint statement of the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, in April, to the effect that both favored the convening of conferences on Cambodia and Laos. Subsequently, however, Hanoi appeared to draw back and to impose conditions at variance with the Cambodian proposal.

We look beyond a just and enduring peace for Vietnam and Laos and Cambodia, to the day when Peiping will be ready to join in a general settlement in the Far East—a general settlement that would remove the threat of aggression and make it possible for all the peoples of the area to devote themselves to economic and social progress.

Several of the nations of Asia are densely populated. And high rates of population growth make it difficult for them to increase per capita incomes. The solution to these problems cannot be found through external aggression. They must be achieved internally within each nation.

As President Johnson has said, the United States stands ready to assist and support co-operative programs for economic development in Asia. Already we are making available additional funds for the development of the Mekong Valley. And we are taking the lead in organizing an Asian Development Bank, which we hope will be supported by all the major industrialized nations, including the Soviet Union. We would welcome membership by North Vietnam, when it has ceased its aggression.

Those are our objectives—peace and a better life for all who are willing to live at peace with their neighbors.

The present path

I turn now to the specific actions we are taking to convince Hanoi that it will not succeed and that it must move toward a peaceful solution.

Secretary McNamara is appearing before the appropriate committees of the Congress to discuss the military situation within South Vietnam in detail. In essence, our present view is that it is crucial to turn the tide in the south, and that for this purpose it is necessary to send substantial numbers of additional American forces.

The primary responsibility for defeating the Vietcong will remain, however, with the South Vietnamese. They have some 545,000 men in military and paramilitary forces. Despite losses, every branch of the armed forces of South Vietnam has more men under arms than it had 6 months ago. And they are making systematic efforts to increase their forces still further. The primary missions of American ground forces are to secure the air bases used by the South Vietnamese and ourselves and to provide a strategic reserve, thus releasing South Vietnamese troops for offensive actions against the Vietcong. In securing the air bases and related military installations, American Forces are pushing out into the countryside to prevent build-ups for surprise attacks. And they may be used in emergencies to help the South Vietnamese in combat. But the main task of rooting out the Vietcong will continue to be the responsibility of the South Vietnamese. And we have seen no sign that they are about to try to shift that responsibility to us. On the contrary, the presence of increasing numbers of American combat troops seems to have stimulated greater efforts on the part of the fighting men of South Vietnam.

At the same time, on the military side, we shall maintain, with the South Vietnamese, our program of limited air attacks on military targets in North Vietnam. This program is a part of the total strategy. We had never expected that air attacks on North Vietnam alone would bring Hanoi to a quick decision to cease its aggression. Hanoi has been committed to its aggression too long and too deeply to turn around overnight. It must be convinced that it faces not only continuing, and perhaps increased, pressure on the North itself, but also that it simply cannot win in the South.

The air attacks on the North have also had specific military effects in reducing the scale of increased infiltration from the North. Finally, they are important as a warning to all concerned that there are no longer sanctuaries for aggression.

It has been suggested in some quarters that Hanoi would be more disposed to move to negotiations and to cease its aggression if we stopped bombing the North. We do not rule out the possibility of another and longer pause in bombing, but the question remains—and we have repeatedly asked it: What would happen from the North in response? Would Hanoi withdraw the 325th Division of the Regular Army, which is now deployed in South Vietnam and across the line in Laos? Would it take home the other men it has infiltrated into the South? Would it stop sending arms and ammunition into South Vietnam? Would the campaign of assassination and sabotage in the South cease? We have been trying to find out what would happen if we were to suspend our bombing of the North. We have not been able to get an answer or even a hint.

Those who complain about air attacks on military targets in North Vietnam would carry more weight if they had manifested, or would manifest now, appropriate concern about the infiltrations from the North, the high rate of military activity in the South,

and the ruthless campaign of terror and assassination which is being conducted in the South under the direction of Hanoi and with its active support.

The situation in South Vietnam

Let me now underline just a few points about the political and economic situation in South Vietnam. For we know well that, while security is fundamental to turning the tide, it remains vital to do all we can on the political and economic fronts.

All of us have been concerned, of course, by the difficulties of the South Vietnamese in developing an effective and stable government. But this failure should not astonish us. South Vietnam is a highly plural society striving to find its political feet under very adverse conditions. Other nations—new and old—with fewer difficulties and unmolested by determined aggressors have done no better. South Vietnam emerged from the French Indochina war with many political factions, most of which were firmly anti-Communist. Despite several significant initial successes in establishing a degree of political harmony, the government of President Diem could not maintain a lasting unity among the many factions. The recent shifting and reshuffling of Vietnamese Governments is largely the continuing search for political unity and a viable regime which can overcome these long-evident political divisions.

And we should not forget that the destruction of the fabric of government at all levels has been a primary objective of the Vietcong. The Vietcong has assassinated thousands of local officials—and health workers and schoolteachers and others who were helping to improve the life of the people of the countryside. In the last year and a half, it has killed, wounded, or kidnaped 2,291 village officials and 22,146 other civilians—these on top of its thousands of earlier victims.

Despite the risks to themselves and their families, Vietnamese have continued to come forward to fill these posts. And in the last 6 years, no political dissenter of any consequence has gone over to the Vietcong. The Buddhists, the Catholics, the sects, the Cambodians (of whom there are about a million in South Vietnam), the Montagnards—all the principal elements in South Vietnamese political life except the Vietcong itself, which is a very small minority—remain overwhelmingly anti-Communist.

The suggestion that Ho Chi Minh probably could win a free election in South Vietnam is directly contrary to all the evidence we have. And we have a great deal of evidence, for we have Americans—in twos and threes and fours and sixes—in the countryside in all parts of Vietnam. In years past Ho Chi Minh was a hero throughout Vietnam. For he had led the fight against the Japanese and then against the French. But his glamor began to fade when he set up a Communist police state in the North—and the South, by contrast, made great progress under a non-Communist nationalist government. Today the North Vietnamese regime is badly discredited. We find the South Vietnamese in the countryside ready to cooperate with their own government when they can do so with reasonable hope of not being assassinated by the Vietcong the next night.

At the present time, somewhat more than 50 percent of the people of Vietnam live in areas under shifting control. And about 25 percent live in areas under varying degrees of Vietcong control. But even where it succeeds in imposing taxes, drafting recruits and commandeering labor, the Vietcong has not usually been able to organize the area. We have a good deal of evidence that Vietcong tax exactions and terrorism have increasingly alienated the villagers. And one of the problems with which the South Vietnamese Government and we have to deal is the large scale exodus from the Central High-

lands to the coastal areas of refugees from the Vietcong.

It is of the greatest significance that, despite many years of harsh war, despite the political instability of the central government, and despite division of their country since 1954, the people of South Vietnam fight on with uncommon determination. There is no evidence among politicians, the bureaucracy, the military, the major religious groups, the youth, or even the peasantry of a desire for peace at any price. They all oppose surrender or accommodation on a basis which would lead to a Communist take-over. The will to resist the aggression from the North has survived through periods of great stress and remains strong.

The central objective of our foreign policy is a peaceful community of nations, each free to choose its own institutions but cooperating with one another to promote their mutual welfare. It is the kind of world order envisaged in the opening sections of the United Nations Charter. But there have been and still are important forces in the world which seek a different goal—which deny the right of free choice, which seek to expand their influence and empires by every means, including force.

The bulwark of peace

In defense of peace and freedom and the right of free choice:

We and others insisted that the Soviets withdraw their forces from Iran.

We went to the aid of Turkey and Greece. We joined in organizing the European recovery program and in forming the North Atlantic Alliance.

We and our allies have defended the freedom of West Berlin.

We and 15 other nations joined in repelling the aggression in Korea.

We have joined defensive alliances with many other nations and have helped them to strengthen their defensive military forces.

We supported the United Nations in its efforts to preserve the independence of the Congo.

We insisted that the Soviet Union withdraw strategic weapons from Cuba.

Had we not done these things—and others—the enemies of freedom would now control much of the world and be in a position to destroy us or at least to sap our strength by economic strangulation.

For the same basic reasons that we took all these other measures to deter or to repel aggression, we are determined to assist the people of South Vietnam to defeat this aggression.

In his last public utterance, recorded only half an hour before his death, a great and beloved American, Adlai Stevenson, said:

"There has been a great deal of pressure on me in the United States from many sources to take a position—a public position—inconsistent with that of my Government. Actually, I don't agree with those protestants. My hope in Vietnam is that resistance there may establish the fact that changes in Asia are not to be precipitated by outside forces."

I believe, with the President, that "once the Communists know, as we know, that a violent solution is impossible, then a peaceful solution is inevitable."

The great bulwark of peace for all free-men—and therefore of peace for the millions ruled by the adversaries of freedom—has been, and is today, the power of the United States and our readiness to use that power, in cooperation with other free nations, to deter or to defeat aggression, and to help other free nations to go forward economically, socially, and politically.

We have had to cope with a long series of dangerous crises caused by the aggressive appetites of others. But we are a great nation and people. I am confident that we will meet this test, as we have met others.

THE TASKS OF DEFENSE

(Statement by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, before the Defense Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, August 4, 1965)

The issue in Vietnam is essentially the same as it was in 1954 when President Eisenhower said:

"I think it is no longer necessary to enter into a long argument or exposition to show the importance to the United States of Indochina and of the struggle going on there. No matter how the struggle may have started, it has long since become one of the testing places between a free form of government and dictatorship. Its outcome is going to have the greatest significance for us, and possibly for a long time into the future."

"We have here a sort of cork in the bottle, the bottle being the great area that includes Indonesia, Burma, Thailand, all of the surrounding areas of Asia with its hundreds of millions of people. . . ."

The nature of the conflict

What is at stake in Vietnam today is the ability of the free world to block Communist armed aggression and prevent the loss of all of southeast Asia, a loss which in its ultimate consequences could drastically alter the strategic situation in Asia and the Pacific to the grave detriment of our own security and that of our allies. While 15 years ago, in Korea, Communist aggression took the form of an overt armed attack, today in South Vietnam, it has taken the form of a large scale intensive guerrilla operation.

The covert nature of this aggression, which characterized the earlier years of the struggle in South Vietnam, has now all but been stripped away. The control of the Vietcong effort by the regime in Hanoi, supported and incited by Communist China, has become increasingly apparent.

The struggle there has enormous implications for the security of the United States and the free world, and for that matter, the Soviet Union as well. The North Vietnamese and the Chinese Communists have chosen to make South Vietnam the test case for their particular version of the so-called wars of national liberation. The extent to which violence should be used in overthrowing non-Communist governments has been one of the most bitterly contested issues between the Chinese and the Soviet Communists.

Although the former Chairman, Mr. Khrushchev, fully endorsed wars of national liberation as the preferred means of extending the sway of communism, he cautioned that "this does not necessarily mean that the transition to socialism will everywhere and in all cases be linked with armed uprising and civil war. . . . Revolution by peaceful means accords with the interests of the working class and the masses."

The Chinese Communists, however, insist that:

"Peaceful coexistence cannot replace the revolutionary struggles of the people. The transition from capitalism to socialism in any country can only be brought about through proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in that country. . . . The vanguard of the proletariat will remain unconquerable in all circumstances only if it masters all forms of struggle—peaceful and armed, open and secret, legal and illegal, parliamentary struggle and mass struggle, and so forth." (Letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, June 14, 1963.)

Their preference for violence was even more emphatically expressed in an article in the Peiping People's Daily of March 31, 1964:

"It is advantageous from the point of view of tactics to refer to the desire for peaceful transition, but it would be inappropriate to emphasize the possibility of peace-

ful transition. . . . the proletarian party must never substitute parliamentary struggle for proletarian revolution or entertain the illusion that the transition to socialism can be achieved through the parliamentary road. Violent revolution is a universal law of proletarian revolution. To realize the transition to socialism, the proletariat must wage armed struggle, smash the old state machine and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . ."

"Political power," the article quotes Mao Tse-tung as saying, "grows out of the barrel of a gun."

Throughout the world we see the fruits of these policies and in Vietnam, particularly, we see the effects of the Chinese Communists' more militant stance and their hatred of the free world. They make no secret of the fact that Vietnam is the test case, and neither does the regime in Hanoi. General Giap, head of the North Vietnamese Army, recently said that "South Vietnam is the model of the national liberation movement of our time. . . . If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated everywhere in the world." And, Pham Van Dong, Premier of North Vietnam, pointed out that "The experience of our compatriots in South Vietnam attracts the attention of the world, especially the peoples of South America."

It is clear that a Communist success in South Vietnam would be taken as proof that the Chinese Communists' position is correct and they will have made a giant step forward in their efforts to seize control of the world Communist movement.

Furthermore, such a success would greatly increase the prestige of Communist China among the nonaligned nations and strengthen the position of their followers everywhere. In that event we would then have to be prepared to cope with the same kind of aggression in other parts of the world wherever the existing governments are weak and the social structures fragmented. If Communist armed aggression is not stopped in Vietnam, as it was in Korea, the confidence of small nations in America's pledges of support will be weakened and many of them, in widely separated areas of the world, will feel unsafe.

Thus, the stakes in South Vietnam are far greater than the loss of one small country to communism. Its loss would be a most serious setback to the cause of freedom and would greatly complicate the task of preventing the further spread of militant Asian communism. And, if that spread is not halted, our strategic position in the world will be weakened and our national security directly endangered.

Conditions leading to the present situation in South Vietnam

Essential to a proper understanding of the present situation in South Vietnam is a recognition of the fact that the so-called insurgency there is planned, directed, controlled and supported from Hanoi.

True, there is a small dissident minority in South Vietnam, but the government could cope with it if it were not directed and supplied from the outside. As early as 1960, at the Third Congress of the North Vietnamese Communist Party, both Ho Chi Minh and General Giap spoke of the need to "step up" the "revolution in the South." In March 1963 the party organ Hoc Tap stated that the authorities in South Vietnam "are well aware that North Vietnam is the firm base for the southern revolution and the point on which it leans, and that our party is the steady and experienced vanguard unit of the working class and people and is the brain and factor that decides all victories of the revolution."

Through most of the past decade the North Vietnamese Government denied and went to great efforts to conceal the scale of its per-

August 23, 1963

20623

sonnel and materiel support, in addition to direction and encouragement, to the Vietcong.

It had strong reasons to do so. The North Vietnamese regime had no wish to force upon the attention of the world its massive and persistent violations of its Geneva pledges of 1954 and 1962 regarding noninterference in South Vietnam and Laos.

However, in building up the Vietcong forces for a decisive challenge, the authorities in North Vietnam have increasingly dropped the disguises that gave their earlier support a clandestine character.

Through 1963, the bulk of the arms infiltrated from the North were old French and American models acquired prior to 1954 in Indochina and Korea.

Now, the flow of weapons from North Vietnam consists almost entirely of the latest arms acquired from Communist China; and the flow is large enough to have entirely re-equipped the main force units, despite the capture this year by government forces of thousands of these weapons and millions of rounds of the new ammunition.

Likewise, through 1963, nearly all the personnel infiltrating through Laos, trained and equipped in the North and ordered South, were former Southerners.

But in the last 18 months, the great majority of the infiltrators—more than 10,000 of them—have been ethnic northerners, mostly draftees ordered into the People's Army of Vietnam for duty in the South. And it now appears that, starting their journey through Laos last December, from one to three regiments of a North Vietnamese regular division, the 325th Division of the North Vietnamese Army, have deployed into the Central Highlands of South Vietnam for combat alongside the Vietcong.

Thus, despite all its reasons for secrecy, Hanoi's desire for decisive results this summer has forced it to reveal its hand even more openly.

The United States during the last 4 years has steadily increased its help to the people of South Vietnam in an effort to counter this ever-increasing scale of Communist aggression. These efforts achieved some measure of success during 1962. The South Vietnamese forces in that year made good progress in suppressing the Vietcong insurrection.

Although combat deaths suffered by these forces in 1962 rose by 11 percent over the 1961 level (from about 4,000 to 4,450), Vietcong combat deaths increased by 72 percent (from about 12,000 to 21,000). Weapons lost by the South Vietnamese fell from 5,900 in 1961 to 5,200 in 1962, while the number lost by the Vietcong rose from 2,750 to 4,050. The Government's new strategic hamlet program was just getting underway and was showing promise. The economy was growing and the Government seemed firmly in control. Therefore, in early 1963, I was able to say: " . . . victory over the Vietcong will most likely take many years. But now, as a result of the operations of the last year, there is a new feeling of confidence, not only on the part of the Government of South Vietnam but also among the populace, that victory is possible."

But at the same time I also cautioned: "We are not unmindful of the fact that the pressures on South Vietnam may well continue through infiltration via the Laos corridor. Nor are we unmindful of the possibility that the Communists, sensing defeat in their covert efforts, might resort to overt aggression from North Vietnam. Obviously, this latter contingency could require a greater direct participation by the United States. The survival of an independent government in South Vietnam is so important to the security of all southeast Asia and to the free world that we must be prepared to take all necessary measures within our capability to prevent a Communist victory."

Unfortunately, the caution voiced in early 1963 proved to be well founded. Late in 1963, the Communists stepped up their efforts, and the military situation began to deteriorate. The Diem government came under increasing internal pressure, and in November it was overthrown. As I reported in February 1964:

"The Vietcong was quick to take advantage of the growing opposition to the Diem Government and the period of uncertainty following its overthrow. Vietcong activities were already increasing in September and continued to increase at an accelerated rate in October and November, particularly in the delta area. And I must report that they have made considerable progress since the coup."

Following the coup, the lack of stability in the central government and the rapid turnover of key personnel, particularly senior military commanders, began to be reflected in combat operations and throughout the entire fabric of the political and economic structure. And, in 1964, the Communists greatly increased the scope and tempo of their subversive efforts. Larger scale attacks became more frequent and the flow of men and supplies from the North expanded. The incidence of terrorism and sabotage rose rapidly and the pressure on the civilian population was intensified.

The deteriorating military situation was clearly reflected in the statistics. South Vietnamese combat deaths rose from 5,650 in 1963 to 7,450 in 1964 and the number of weapons lost from 8,250 to 14,100. In contrast, Vietcong combat deaths dropped from 20,600 to 16,800 and, considering the stepped-up tempo of activity, they experienced only a very modest rise in the rate of weapons lost (from 5,400 to 5,900).

At various times in recent months, I have called attention to the continued buildup of Communist forces in South Vietnam. I pointed out that although these forces had not been committed to combat in any significant degree, they probably would be after the start of the monsoon season. It is now clear that these forces are being committed in increasing numbers and that the Communists have decided to make an all-out attempt to bring down the Government of South Vietnam.

The entire economic and social structure is under attack. Bridges, railroads, and highways are being destroyed and interdicted. Agricultural products are being barred from the cities. Electric powerplants and communication lines are being sabotaged. Whole villages are being burned and their population driven away, increasing the refugee burden on the South Vietnamese Government.

In addition to the continued infiltration of increasing numbers of individuals and the acceleration of the flow of modern equipment and supplies organized units of the North Vietnamese Army have been identified in South Vietnam. We now estimate the hard core Vietcong strength at some 70,000 men, including a recently reported increase in the number of combat battalions. In addition, they have some 90,000 to 100,000 irregulars and some 30,000 in their political cadres; i.e., tax collectors, propagandists, etc. We have also identified at least three battalions of the regular North Vietnamese Army, and there are probably considerably more.

At the same time the Government of South Vietnam has found it increasingly difficult to make a commensurate increase in the size of its own forces, which now stand at about 545,000 men, including the regional and local defense forces but excluding the national police.

Combat deaths on both sides have been mounting—for the South Vietnamese from an average of 143 men a week in 1964, to about 270 a week for the 4-week period end-

ing July 24 this year. Vietcong losses have gone from 322 a week last year to about 680 a week for the four-week period ending July 24.

Most important, the ratio of South Vietnamese to Vietcong strength has seriously declined in the last 6 or 7 months from about 5 to 1 to about 3 or 3½ to 1; the ratio of combat battalions is substantially less. This is far too low a ratio for a guerrilla war even though the greater mobility and firepower provided to the South Vietnamese forces by the United States help to offset that disadvantage.

The South Vietnamese forces have to defend hundreds of cities, towns, and hamlets while the Vietcong are free to choose the time and place of their attack. As a result, the South Vietnamese are stretched thin in defensive positions, leaving only a small central reserve for offensive action against the Vietcong, while the latter are left free to concentrate their forces and throw them against selected targets. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Vietcong retains most of the initiative.

Even so, we may not as yet have seen the full weight of the Communist attack. Presently, the situation is particularly acute in the northern part of the country where the Communists have mobilized large military forces which pose a threat to the entire region and its major cities and towns. Our air attack may have helped to keep these forces off balance but the threat remains and it is very real.

Clearly, the time has come when the people of South Vietnam need more help from us and other nations if they are to retain their freedom and independence.

We have already responded to that need with some 75,000 U.S. military personnel, including some combat units. This number will be raised to 125,000 almost immediately with the deployment of the Air Mobile Division and certain other forces. But, more help will be needed in the months ahead and additional U.S. combat forces will be required to back up the hard-pressed Army of South Vietnam. Two other nations have provided combat forces—Australia and New Zealand. We hope that by the end of this year others will join them. In this regard, the Koreans have just recently approved a combat division for deployment to Vietnam, which is scheduled to arrive this fall.

Role of U.S. combat forces in South Vietnam

As I noted earlier, the central reserve of the South Vietnamese Army has been seriously depleted in recent months. The principal role of U.S. ground combat forces will be to supplement this reserve in support of the frontline forces of the South Vietnamese Army. The indigenous paramilitary forces will deal with the pacification of areas cleared of organized Vietcong and North Vietnamese units, a role more appropriate for them than for our forces.

The Government of South Vietnam's strategy, with which we concur, is to achieve the initiative, to expand gradually its area of control by breaking up major concentrations of enemy forces, using to the maximum our preponderance of airpower, both land and sea based. The number of fixed-wing attack sorties by U.S. aircraft in South Vietnam will increase manifold by the end of the year.

Armed helicopter sorties will also increase dramatically over the same period, and extension use will be made of heavy artillery, both land based and sea based. At the same time our air and naval forces will continue to interdict the Vietcong supplies line from North Vietnam, both land and sea.

Although our tactics have changed, our objective remains the same.

We have no desire to widen the war. We have no desire to overthrow the North Vietnamese regime, seize its territory or achieve the unification of North and South Vietnam by force of arms. We have no need for per-

20624

manent military bases in South Vietnam or for special privileges of any kind.

What we are seeking through the planned military buildup is to block the Vietcong offensive, to give the people of South Vietnam and their armed forces some relief from the unrelenting Communist pressures—to give them time to strengthen their government, to reestablish law and order, and to revive their economic life which has been seriously disrupted by Vietcong harassment and attack in recent months. We have no illusions that success will be achieved quickly, but we are confident that it will be achieved much more surely by the plan I have outlined.

Increases in U.S. military forces

Fortunately, we have greatly increased the strength and readiness of our Military Establishment since 1961, particularly in the kinds of forces which we now require in southeast Asia. The Active Army has been expanded from 11 to 16 combat ready divisions. Twenty thousand men have been added to the Marine Corps to allow them to fill out their combat structure and at the same time facilitate the mobilization of the Marine Corps Reserve. The tactical fighter squadrons of the Air Force have been increased by 51 percent. Our airlift capability has more than doubled. Special forces trained to deal with insurgency threats have been multiplied elevenfold. General ship construction and conversion has been doubled.

During this same period, procurement for the expanded force has been increased greatly: Air Force tactical aircraft—from \$360 million in 1961 to about \$1.1 billion in the original fiscal year 1966 budget; Navy aircraft—from \$1.8 billion to \$2.2 billion; Army helicopters—from 286 aircraft to over 1,000. Procurement of ordnance, vehicles and related equipment was increased about 150 percent in the fiscal years 1962-64 period, compared with the preceding 3 years. The tonnage of modern nonnuclear air-to-ground ordnance in stock tripled between fiscal year 1961 and fiscal year 1965. In brief, the Military Establishment of the United States, today, is in far better shape than it ever has been in peacetime to face whatever tasks may lie ahead.

Nevertheless, some further increases in forces, military personnel, production, and construction will be required if we are to deploy additional forces to southeast Asia and provide for combat consumption while, at the same time, maintaining our capabilities to deal with crises elsewhere in the world.

To offset the deployments now planned to southeast Asia, and provide some additional forces for possible new deployments, we propose to increase the presently authorized force levels. These increases will be of three types: (1) Additional units for the active forces, over and above those reflected in the January budget; (2) military personnel augmentations for presently authorized units in the Active Forces to man new bases, to handle the larger logistics workload, etc.; and (3) additional personnel and extra training for selected Reserve component units to increase their readiness for quick deployment. We believe we can achieve this buildup without calling up the Reserves or ordering the involuntary extension of tours, except as already authorized by law for the Department of the Navy. Even here the extension of officer tours will be on a selective basis and extensions for enlisted men will be limited, in general, to not more than 4 months.

The program I have outlined here today and the \$1.7 billion amendment to the fiscal year 1966 Defense appropriation bill now before the committee will, in the collective judgment of my principal military and civilian advisers and myself, provide the men, materiel, and facilities required to fulfill the President's pledge to meet the mounting aggression in South Vietnam, while at the same time maintaining the forces required to meet commitments elsewhere in the world.

THE CHALLENGE OF HUMAN NEED

(Address by the President to the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists, the White House, May 13, 1965)

The third face of the war

The war in Vietnam has many faces. There is the face of armed conflict—of terror and gunfire—of bomb-heavy planes and campaign-weary soldiers. . . .

The second face of war in Vietnam is the quest for a political solution—the face of diplomacy and politics—of the ambitions and the interests of other nations. . . .

The third face of war in Vietnam is, at once, the most tragic and most hopeful. It is the face of human need. It is the untended sick, the hungry family, and the illiterate child. It is men and women, many without shelter, with rags for clothing, struggling for survival in a very rich and a very fertile land.

It is the most important battle of all in which we are engaged.

For a nation cannot be built by armed power or by political agreement. It will rest on the expectation by individual men and women that their future will be better than their past.

It is not enough to just fight against something. People must fight for something, and the people of South Vietnam must know that after the long, brutal journey through the dark tunnel of conflict there breaks the light of a happier day. And only if this is so can they be expected to sustain the enduring will for continued strife. Only in this way can long-run stability and peace come to their land.

And there is another, more profound reason. In Vietnam communism seeks to really impose its will by force of arms. But we would be deeply mistaken to think that this was the only weapon. Here, as other places in the world, they speak to restless people—people rising to shatter the old ways which have imprisoned hope—people fiercely and justly reaching for the material fruits from the tree of modern knowledge.

It is this desire, and not simply lust for conquest, which moves many of the individual fighting men that we must now, sadly, call the enemy.

It is, therefore, our task to show that freedom from the control of other nations offers the surest road to progress, that history and experience testify to this truth. But it is not enough to call upon reason or point to examples. We must show it through action and we must show it through accomplishment, and even were there no war—either hot or cold—we would always be active in humanity's search for progress.

This task is commanded to us by the moral values of our civilization, and it rests on the inescapable nature of the world that we have now entered. For in that world, as long as we can foresee, every threat to man's welfare will be a threat to the welfare of our own people. Those who live in the emerging community of nations will ignore the perils of their neighbors at the risk of their own prospects.

Cooperative development in southeast Asia

This is true not only for Vietnam but for every part of the developing world. This is why, on your behalf, I recently proposed a massive, cooperative development effort for all of southeast Asia. I named the respected leader, Eugene Black, as my personal representative to inaugurate our participation in these programs.

Since that time rapid progress has been made, I am glad to report. Mr. Black has met with the top officials of the United Nations on several occasions. He has talked to other interested parties. He has found increasing enthusiasm. The United Nations is already setting up new mechanisms to help carry forward the work of development.

In addition, the United States is now prepared to participate in, and to support, an

Asian Development Bank, to carry out and help finance the economic progress in that area of the world and the development that we desire to see in that area of the world.

So this morning I call on every other industrialized nation, including the Soviet Union, to help create a better life for all of the people of southeast Asia.

Surely, surely, the works of peace can bring men together in a common effort to abandon forever the works of war.

But, as South Vietnam is the central place of conflict, it is also a principal focus for our work to increase the well-being of people.

It is that effort in South Vietnam, of which I think we are too little informed, which I want to relate to you this morning.

Strengthening Vietnam's economy

We began in 1954, when Vietnam became independent, before the war between the north and the south. Since that time we have spent more than \$2 billion in economic help for the 16 million people of South Vietnam. And despite the ravages of war, we have made steady, continuing gains. We have concentrated on food and health and education and housing and industry.

Like most developing countries, South Vietnam's economy rests on agriculture. Unlike many, it has large uncrowded areas of very rich and very fertile land. Because of this, it is one of the great rice bowls of the entire world. With our help, since 1954, South Vietnam has already doubled its rice production, providing food for the people as well as providing a vital export for that nation.

We have put our American farm know-how to work on other crops. This year, for instance, several hundred million cuttings of a new variety of sweet potato, that promises a sixfold increase in yield will be distributed to these Vietnamese farmers. Corn output should rise from 25,000 tons in 1962 to 100,000 tons by 1966. Pig production has more than doubled since 1955. Many animal diseases have been eliminated entirely.

Disease and epidemic brood over every Vietnamese village. In a country of more than 16 million people with a life expectancy of only 35 years, there are only 200 civilian doctors. If the Vietnamese had doctors in the same ratio as the United States has doctors, they would have not the 200 that they do have but they would have more than 5,000 doctors.

We have helped vaccinate, already, over 7 million people against cholera, and millions more against other diseases. Hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese can now receive treatment in the more than 12,000 hamlet health stations that America has built and has stocked. New clinics and surgical suites are scattered throughout the entire country; and the medical school that we are now helping to build will graduate as many doctors in a single year as now serve the entire civilian population of South Vietnam.

Education is the keystone of future development in Vietnam. It takes trained people to man the factories, to conduct the administration, and to form the human foundation for an advancing nation. More than a quarter million young Vietnamese can now learn in more than 4,000 classrooms that America has helped to build in the last 2 years; and 2,000 more schools are going to be built by us in the next 12 months. The number of students in vocational schools has gone up four times. Enrollment was 300,000 in 1955, when we first entered there and started helping with our program. Today it is more than 1,500,000. The 8 million textbooks that we have supplied to Vietnamese children will rise to more than 15 million by 1967.

Agriculture is the foundation. Health, education, and housing are the urgent human needs. But industrial development is the great pathway to their future.

When Vietnam was divided, most of the industry was in the North. The South was

August 23, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20625

barren of manufacturing and the foundations for industry. Today more than 700 new or rehabilitated factories—textile mills and cement plants, electronics and plastics—are changing the entire face of that nation. New roads and communications, railroad equipment, and electric generators are a spreading base on which this new industry can, and is, growing.

Progress in the midst of war

All this progress goes on, and it is going to continue to go on, under circumstances of staggering adversity.

Communist terrorists have made aid programs that we administer a very special target of their attack. They fear them, because agricultural stations are being destroyed and medical centers are being burned. More than 100 Vietnamese malaria fighters are dead. Our own AID officials have been wounded and kidnapped. These are not just the accidents of war. They are a part of a deliberate campaign, in the words of the Communists, "to cut the fingers off the hands of the Government."

We intend to continue, and we intend to increase our help to Vietnam.

Nor can anyone doubt the determination of the South Vietnamese themselves. They have lost more than 12,000 of their men since I became your President a little over a year ago.

But progress does not come from investment alone, or plans on a desk, or even the directives and the orders that we approve here in Washington. It takes men. Men must take the seed to the farmer. Men must teach the use of fertilizer. Men must help in harvest. Men must build the schools, and men must instruct the students. Men must carry medicine into the jungle, and treat the sick, and shelter the homeless. And men—brave, tireless, filled with love for their fellows—are doing this today. They are doing it through the long, hot, danger-filled Vietnamese days and the sultry nights.

The fullest glory must go, also, to those South Vietnamese that are laboring and dying for their own people and their own nation. In hospitals and schools, along the rice fields and the roads, they continue to labor, never knowing when death or terror may strike.

How incredible it is that there are a few who still say that the South Vietnamese do not want to continue the struggle. They are sacrificing and they are dying by the thousands. Their patient valor in the heavy presence of personal physical danger should be a helpful lesson to those of us who, here in America, only have to read about it, or hear about it on the television or radio.

We have our own heroes who labor at the works of peace in the midst of war. They toil unarmed and out of uniform. They know the humanity of their concern does not exempt them from the horrors of conflict, yet they go on from day to day. They bring food to the hungry over there. They supply the sick with necessary medicine. They help the farmer with his crops, families to find clean water, villages to receive the healing miracles of electricity. These are Americans who have joined our AID program, and we welcome others to their ranks.

A call for aid

For most Americans this is an easy war. Men fight and men suffer and men die, as they always do in war. But the lives of most of us, at least those of us in this room and those listening to me this morning, are untroubled. Prosperity rises, abundance increases, the Nation flourishes.

I will report to the Cabinet when I leave this room that we are in the 51st month of continued prosperity, the longest peacetime prosperity for America since our country was founded. Yet our entire future is at stake.

What a difference it would make if we could only call upon a small fraction of our unmatched private resources—businesses and unions, agricultural groups and builders—if we could call them to the task of peaceful progress in Vietnam. With such a spirit of patriotic sacrifice we might well strike an irresistible blow for freedom there and for freedom throughout the world.

I therefore hope that every person within the sound of my voice in this country this morning will look for ways—and those citizens of other nations who believe in humanity as we do, I hope that they will find ways to help progress in South Vietnam.

This, then, is the third face of our struggle in Vietnam. It was there—the illiterate, the hungry, the sick—before this war began. It will be there when peace comes to us—and so will we—not with soldiers and planes, not with bombs and bullets, but with all the wondrous weapons of peace in the 20th century.

And then, perhaps, together, all of the people of the world can share that gracious task with all the people of Vietnam, North and South alike.

HOPE FOR PEACE IN YEMEN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, at a time when a number of world issues are in crisis or in deadlock, it is gratifying to note an act of statesmanship and conciliation. I refer to President Nasser's decision to go to Saudi Arabia on August 22 to discuss the situation in Yemen with King Faisal. In preparation for his discussions with King Faisal, President Nasser has been meeting in Alexandria with Yemeni leaders in an effort to devise proposals for ending the festering Yemeni war.

In the meantime, tensions along the Saudi-Yemeni border, which until quite recently were rising, are now visibly abating. It is to be hoped that reduced hostilities will create a favorable atmosphere for peace negotiations.

President Nasser is often criticized in the United States for provocative actions and policies. It is fair and proper that we commend the President of the United Arab Republic when he takes conciliatory action for peace, as he is now doing with respect to Yemen.

Mr. President, I hope that the negotiations will turn out successfully, as it was a very dangerous situation in that area, and has been for some 3 years.

FURTHER AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the conferees on the Foreign Assistance Act met 14 times before final agreement was reached on the text now before the Senate. As usual, the subject of foreign aid has been actively before the Senate in one form or another since March, a period of 6 months, and we have not yet acted on the appropriations bill.

I wish I could report to my colleagues that they would not need to begin the process all over again 3 or 4 months hence. But this is not the case because

the Senate conferees reluctantly—certainly, from my point of view, most reluctantly—were forced to accept those provisions of the House bill which authorized the program for only 1 more year.

Depressing as I personally find it to ask for approval of this conference report, nevertheless, I believe that it is possible we may have laid the groundwork for more thorough reforms next year. For the record, I wish to state that the Senate conferees, in agreeing with the House conferees to omit from this year's act Senate language authorizing a 2-year aid program and calling for a planning committee to study the basic principles underlying U.S. aid programs, placed reliance on the following factors. With respect to the 2-year authorization, the Senate conferees receded on the basis of:

First. The willingness of the House members of the committee of the conference to urge their House colleagues next year "to examine with the greatest care such proposals as may be submitted authorizing foreign aid programs for 2 or more years"; and

Second. The statement of the Secretary of State when he met with the Foreign Relations Committee on August 12, 1965, that next year "the administration expects to request that the multiyear principle adopted by the Congress in 1961 and 1962 for development lending be extended to include all other authorizations contained in the foreign aid bill to be proposed early in the next session of Congress."

I am hopeful that next year with the support of the administration and with the agreement of the House conferees, to examine a longer term authorization "with the greatest of care" that some headway may be made so we may get away from the dreary cycle of 1-year aid programs.

Throughout the conference, the House conferees reiterated time and time again that one of the reasons why they were unwilling to accept the amendment was that it was not requested by the administration. Whether that will be determinative, I do not know, but at least one step forward has been taken. Generally speaking, the administration's recommendations in these matters are given serious consideration by both bodies.

On the subject of the Senate's proposal to create a planning committee to examine the basic principles of foreign aid, the Senate receded on the basis of the following factors:

First. The statement of the conferees of both Houses urging the President "to inaugurate a review of the aid program as presently constituted, seeking to direct it more effectively toward the solution of the problems of the developing countries," and

Second. The statement of the Secretary of State on the occasion referred to above that, despite its opposition to the creation of the foreign aid planning committee and certain other related provisions, nevertheless, the administration recognizes "the concern of the Senate about the future content and direction of the foreign aid program."

20626

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 23, 1965

In this connection I may say that I have already requested our chief of staff of the committee to undertake preliminary preparations for a review of our aid program by the committee. We have done this in the past in other fields. I am sure this can be very useful in this connection.

The Secretary of State added:

We would be very pleased to assist in any way we could any studies undertaken by the two legislative committees. In addition, the executive branch, prompted by these congressional concerns, will conduct a special study of the program, giving particular attention to the issues raised by this committee: the number of countries receiving assistance; the requirements for assistance and the prospects for achieving our objectives and terminating assistance; the contribution of other developed countries; and the appropriate relationships between bilateral and multilateral assistance.

On the subject of whether the national interest might better be served by increasing the proportion of development aid to be administered by the World Bank and related agencies, rather than solely through U.S. agencies, the Senate conferees were assured by the statement of the Secretary of State that the administration has asked the Appropriations Committee to "remove the prohibition in the Appropriations Act on the use of the authority of section 205 of the Foreign Assistance Act."

This provision in past AID appropriation acts has prohibited the effective use of certain percentages, in the past, 10 percent and under the present bill, 15 percent, of the Development Loan Fund to be made available to international development agencies.

I hope very much that the Appropriations Committee will follow the recommendations of the administration on this point and will not this year nullify the considered provision of the authorizing legislation specifying that not to exceed 15 percent of the Development Loan Fund may be used by the President through lending institutions such as the Bank and the International Development Association. This would enable the aid program to urge other free nations to help in the development process.

Secretary Rusk stated:

The executive branch and the Congress are in agreement on the desirability of enlarging the resources available to international aid-giving agencies on the basis of cost-sharing among the advanced countries. This is still our policy.

I regret that the Senate conferees were not able to prevail upon their House counterparts to accept this year the provisions of the so-called Morse amendment. That amendment would immediately have inaugurated a much needed review of the aid program. It provided clear mandates as to the desirability of interrupting aid continuity "in its present form." The series of basic principles set forth in that amendment went to the heart of the proliferation of country programs without tying these programs to principles by which we might have promoted a tightened definition of the national interest.

I also regret that we were not able to put the aid program on a 2-year basis, thus enabling the Committee on Foreign

Relations and the Senate to devote more time and attention to the many areas of foreign policy which need review and more modern mandates.

There were, of course, a number of other points in issue between the two Houses. This disposition of these issues is set forth in the conference report.

A number of loopholes were closed, including a blanket authorization provision which existed in the House bill.

The overall amount authorized in the bill and previous aid legislation is \$3.36 billion which is some \$97 million less than the administration asked for in March. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a table showing the disposition of the administration's request on an item by item basis.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

The following table shows the differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment, the sums agreed to by the committee of conference and the administration appropriation request for programs authorized in this bill and in existing law:

Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 (fiscal year 1966)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Executive appropriation request	House	Senate	Conference	Adjustment against House bill	Adjustment against Senate amendment
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(2) and (4)	(3) and (4)
Development Loan Fund.....	780,250	(1)	(1)	(1)		
Technical cooperation and development grants.....	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000		
For southeast Asia ¹	9,000		9,000	9,000		+9,000
American schools and hospitals abroad.....	7,000	7,000	9,000	7,000		-2,000
Alliance for Progress ²	580,125	(2)	(2)	(2)		
Grants.....	(85,000)	(85,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(-10,000)	(-15,000)
International organizations and programs.....	145,565	144,755	145,455	144,755		+1,000
Supporting assistance.....	369,200	360,200	350,000	369,200		+10,200
For southeast Asia ³	80,000	(2)	80,000	(2)		+80,000
Contingency fund ⁴	60,000	50,000	60,000	50,000		+10,000
Military assistance.....	1,170,000	1,170,000	1,170,000	1,170,000		
Administrative expenses:						
AID.....	55,240	55,240	55,240	55,240	+1,000	-1,000
State Department.....	3,100	(1)	(1)	(1)		
Special authorization for southeast Asia ⁵	(2)	(1)	(1)		+89,000	+89,000
Total.....	3,459,470	3,004,195	2,079,695	2,094,195	+95,000	+14,000

¹ Existing law authorizes an appropriation of \$1,500,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, plus unappropriated portions of amounts authorized for fiscal years 1962-65. The Executive request for fiscal year 1966 is \$780,250,000.

² The House bill contained an authorization for an appropriation for military and economic programs in southeast Asia of such sums as may be necessary in fiscal year 1966. This was added to the section of the law relating to the contingency fund. The Senate amendment added \$90,000,000 to the authorization for technical cooperation and \$80,000,000 to the authorization for supporting assistance to reflect the Executive request of \$89,000,000 for use in southeast Asia.

³ Existing law authorizes an appropriation of \$600,000,000 for fiscal year 1966 against which the Executive has requested an appropriation of \$580,125,000. Neither the House bill nor the Senate amendment made any change in the total authorization for the Alliance for Progress for fiscal year 1966.

⁴ Existing law contains a continuing authorization for such sums as necessary. The Executive has requested an appropriation of \$3,100,000.

RECAPITULATION

Total amount of new authorizations contained in H.R. 7750..... \$2,094,195,000
Appropriations requested against previous authorizations:

Development Loan Fund.....	\$780,250,000
Alliance for Progress.....	530,125,000
State Department administrative expenses.....	3,100,000
	1,363,475,000

Total authorized and requested for fiscal year 1966..... \$3,459,470,000
Limitation on aggregate authorization for fiscal year 1966..... \$3,360,000,000

Difference..... \$97,070,000

NOTE.—The Senate amendment contained a limitation on the aggregate authorization for use in fiscal year 1966 of \$3,243,000,000. The conferees agreed to a limitation of \$3,360,000,000.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Who is the acting majority leader at the present time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. MORSE. Who is the acting Republican minority leader?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would say that it is the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. MORSE. There is quite a vacuum of empty seats. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT LEGISLATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier today I had the honor of appearing before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and

August 23, 1965

Frankly, two or three times in the past on this score, I have felt impelled to disagree strongly with President Johnson in connection with his assertion as to the role of the Executive under provisions of various bills passed by the Congress.

Today, however, I must with equal vigor rise to support President Johnson's veto of H.R. 8439, which he rejected on the grounds, as he said, that the limitations placed by section 611 of the bill impinged on his constitutional powers.

I must agree with the President that the Constitution grants the Chief Executive sole authority over the operation of our Defense Establishment.

As such, I concur with him that the Congress went too far when it reserved to itself certain powers over the retention or closing of certain military bases.

In this regard, therefore, if occasion arises, I will be constrained to uphold the President's veto.

Know the Facts in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 23, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I share Thomas Jefferson's sentiment that error is best defeated where reason is left free to combat it. I strongly defend, therefore, the right of all Americans to dissent, to criticize, and to protest the policies of their Government.

I think it important, however, that critics of our Nation's present course in Vietnam weigh heavily a potential side-effect of their protests, the danger of giving unintended moral support to our enemy. A recent article on this subject in the Aurora Beacon-News impressed me deeply, and I offer it today for entry in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Aurora Beacon-News, Aug. 11, 1965]

RADICALS DAMAGE U.S. INTENT: HOME TACTICS PROLONG WAR

Recent visitors to North Vietnam have been dumbfounded by the surrealist illogic of the oriental Communist mind.

The visitors, some of them pro-Communist and others sympathetic to the Hanoi regime, said they found no thoughts of peace among North Vietnamese.

The collective opinion was that the United States was on the verge of collapse and that President Johnson was soon to be impeached. It was based on the belief that criticism of official policy in colleges and assorted domestic talk of appeasement would soon lead to a revolution.

Completely ignored was the fact that a majority of the people in the United States and most of the elected representatives in Congress support the President overwhelmingly.

In his many public statements the President correctly assesses the public will by giving

notice that the United States will win the war in Vietnam. At the same time he leaves the door to peace open, but not at the price of national disgrace.

The domestic dialog by so-called intellectuals calling for appeasement is certainly a minority voice. As small as it is, however, it plays directly into the North Vietnam Communists' hands.

Particularly disturbing is evidence that the talk of appeasement has found a hold in the lower echelon of official circles. There is a growing discussion in Washington and the United Nations that the United States is willing to negotiate on the terms set forth by the Vietcong.

These terms are American withdrawal, temporary neutralization of South Vietnam, communication and reunification of the Nation. They are wholly unacceptable and undermine the President's often-stated determination to use all of our resources to win the war, while keeping the door open to honorable negotiations. Giving Vietnam to the Communists is not the basis for negotiations.

Since the United States asked the United Nations to direct its attention to peace in southeast Asia, there have been further reports.

These include, theoretically, U.S. willingness to hold elections in South Vietnam and face-saving devices to allow the Viet Cong to participate in discussions as a party.

The United Nations' attention is, of course, desirable. It may serve to convince the unconvinced that aggression in Vietnam is totally the responsibility of the Communists. It also may remind the world that the Viet Cong do not really want peace.

However, there is no guarantee of free and impartial elections until the South Vietnamese and the United States win a military victory and can offer proper supervision. The U.N. burdened by peace-keeping costs already, could not guarantee impartial elections at this time.

Giving in to the atheistic Communists on these terms would in effect be making them a gift of southeast Asia. It would be a betrayal of the servicemen offering their lives, and the American majority.

Discussions for peace must go on by all means. However, they must be from strength and at this time, unfortunately, that strength can come only from united purpose at home and the military capabilities to force negotiations.

Medical Care in Veterans' Administration Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 23, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to get a better insight into the quality of hospital care provided by the Veterans' Administration hospital system, I recently had sent 2,682 letters to veterans who had recently been patients in a Veterans' Administration hospital. This was a 30-percent sample of all veterans discharged from Veterans' Administration general hospitals during the period June 14 to 18, after care for a medical or surgical condition.

The return of the questionnaire was very good—a little over 53 percent, or

1,434. Generally, the response indicates that veterans were pleased with the treatment they received in the hospital. In response to the question, "What is your overall evaluation of the care you received while a patient?" 83 percent replied, "Excellent"; 12.8 percent replied, "Fair"; and 2 percent replied, "Poor." An additional 2.2 percent made no reply to this question.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in my remarks the text of the letter and questionnaire, as well as a table summarizing the results. A complete summary of the questionnaire is available at the committee office in the form of Committee Print No. 109:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1965.

DEAR SIR: As a recent patient in a Veterans' Administration hospital you now have some definite opinions about the hospital in which you were treated and the care rendered to you. Will you share them with me?

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has legislative oversight responsibilities over the Veterans' Administration and thus has a keen interest in the medical and hospital program operated through the Department of Medicine and Surgery for the care of our sick and disabled veterans. May I ask you to help make this hospital system better for others and for you if you should ever need to be hospitalized in a Veterans' Administration hospital again?

By completing the short-card questionnaire and adding your comments, you will be helping the Veterans' Administration and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to insure better patient care.

Please note that you are not required to sign your name. The postcard requires no postage. Simply drop it in the most convenient mailbox.

Your cooperation will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

Location of hospital _____
Disease or disability treated was service connected ☐. Nonservice connected ☐.
Was your admission to the hospital prompt ☐. Slow ☐. Very slow ☐.
Was the housekeeping in your room excellent ☐. Good ☐. Poor ☐.
Were your hospital meals excellent ☐. Good ☐. Poor ☐.
Was your nursing care excellent ☐. Good ☐. Poor ☐.
Were your aids and orderlies courteous and helpful? Always ☐. Usually ☐. Never ☐.
Were other hospital personnel courteous and pleasant? Always ☐. Usually ☐. Never ☐.
Were you kept informed about special procedure (X-ray, blood tests, etc.) and about changes in your routine which they necessitated? Always ☐. Usually ☐. Never ☐.
What did you like best about your care? _____

What did you like least about your care? _____

What is your overall evaluation of the care you received while a patient here? Excellent ☐. Fair ☐. Poor ☐.

August 23, 1965

tive, who in turn files a petition for removal from the home.

JUVENILE PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION DEALS EXCLUSIVELY WITH NEGLIGENCE, MISTREATMENT

The Juvenile Protective Association is a specialized private service agency operating in the city of Chicago which accepts only cases in which the "presenting problem is the neglect or mistreatment of children."

When a referral is made to it, the JPA assigns a caseworker to the family who obtains background information from schools and other sources. The initial objective of the caseworker is to establish good rapport with the family. To give meaning to the counseling, the caseworker may perform such services as "finding them better apartments, intervening with creditors, and finding emergency shelter for mother and children as protection against a dangerous father." Like the Department of Public Aid, this agency makes a referral to a family court if it becomes necessary to seek removal of the children from the home.

If court proceedings are instituted by the social agency, by the reason of the Family Court Act of Illinois protecting the "neglected child," the State of Illinois actually prosecutes the petition. The parent has the right to select an attorney to represent him at the court hearing. The family court also makes provision for the parent to demand a jury trial if he so chooses.

FAMILY COURT TAKES APPROPRIATE STEPS

The judge of the court after hearing the evidence may do one of the following: (1) dismiss the petition if there is insufficient evidence to indicate that the child is dependent; or (2) find that the child is dependent due to adequate evidence.

If the judge finds that the child is a dependent child, he may (1) place the child on probation and may permit him to remain in the home; or (2) order that the child be removed from the home and placed in the care of another person, a licensed foster home, or in a private school.

Obtaining clear-cut evidence of abuse presents an imposing obstacle to a decision against the parent, because the abusive act usually occurs in the home where family members are the only witnesses. Rarely will the abusive parent admit his action, not only because society does not condone such behavior, but also because prosecution may follow.

RIGHTS OF CHILDREN RESPONSIBILITY OF ALL

It is not only within the scope of his authority but a compulsory part of his responsibility as the educational leader of the community that the principal act in behalf of the abused child. Safeguarding the rights of children, however, is the responsibility of all of the community leaders, since children are the raw material out of which future mature, cooperating adults must be formed. This safeguard is a joint professional venture in which sociologists, psychologists, school administrators, school personnel, medical doctors, the police, the law, and public health and community agencies must cooperate.

¹ James D. Delsordo, "Protective Casework for Abused Children," *Children*, X No. 6 (November, December 1963), pp. 213-218.

² C. Henry Kempe, Frederic N. Silverman, Erandt F. Steele, William Droegemueller, and Henry K. Silver, "The Battered-Child Syndrome," *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, CLXXXI (July 7, 1962), p. 17.

³ Cook County Department of Public Aid, "Provision of Services," manual (May 1, 1968), sec. 6110.

⁴ G. Lewis Penner, "Juvenile Protective Association, Service Report," (Sept. 10, 1963), p. 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ The Family Court Act of the State of Illinois defines "dependent child" as one who,

among other things, lacks proper parental care or guardianship or who has a home which by reason of neglect or cruelty by the parents is unfit for such a child.

The Real Alabama—Part XLIX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 23, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, at a time when water pollution is a major concern for our country it will come as welcome news that important segments of private industry are taking action to help fight the problem.

In July of this year the Gulf States Paper Corp. of Alabama, completed construction of a new waste system that attacks water pollution in three ways. The new facilities are located at the company's plant at Demopolis and will serve to help assure clean water in the important Tombigbee River which we hope will someday be a link in a new water transportation route between the port city of Mobile and the Tennessee River.

An article telling more about the new antipollution system follows:

GULF STATES PAPER RETURNS CLEAN WATER WITH NEW SYSTEM

Gulf States Paper Corp., in July, took the wraps off a new mill waste system that aims a three-pronged attack at stream pollution.

The unique installation divides mill effluent into three different channels to be treated according to type and strength before flowing into the Tombigbee River.

Representatives of State and local government, industry, and wildlife groups were treated to a look at this recently completed system in Demopolis, which company officials describe as a new concept in stream protection.

The mill is surrounded by elaborate ponding and clarifying facilities each dedicated to the treatment of a special type of waste water from the various stages of manufacture. Into one lagoon goes water that contains no harmful materials but needs to be cooled before returning to the river. A huge clarifier, 266 feet in diameter, removes solids such as wood fibers that would otherwise flow into the Tombigbee.

The third phase is a 56-acre lagoon which impounds waste water containing nonfibrous material from the wood that could be harmful to the stream. This effluent can be retained for periods up to 2 weeks, during which time its harmful properties are dissipated. It is then metered back into the river at a rate determined by the flow of the stream.

The new effluent system is only the latest of a series of industrial "firsts" that are part of the sprawling mill. Built around the Nation's first—and then largest—continuous digester, the mill has been the technical model of the industry since it went into production. The continuous digester produces a steady stream of pulp, rather than turning it out by the traditional "batch" method.

In 1964, the digester was placed under the control of an electronic computer which automatically makes any corrections needed to produce uniform pulp. This, too, is an innovation in the paper industry.

To the east of the mill a small lake allows

the cooling of water that has become heated in condensing steam produced in the chemical recovery section of the mill. This lagoon also serves as a safety check to guard against any mishaps that might endanger the condition of the river. Should such upset conditions occur, a sensing system automatically sounds an alarm and shuts off the discharge valve at the lagoon.

Four million gallons of water can be processed daily here. Now covering 9 acres with a 20-million-gallon capacity, the pond can readily be enlarged to 25 acres with a 105-million-gallon capacity.

On the opposite side of the mill is the clarifier which handles 10 million gallons of water a day. Water fed into this system contains solid materials such as fibers, lime and clays that have slipped through in the washing, bleaching, and forming processes. Such materials, if allowed to flow into the river, would use up vital dissolved oxygen and create sludge beds.

The clarifier is a huge, dish-shaped installation, 266 feet in diameter and 15 feet deep at the center. Mill water is pumped to the center surface, from which point it flows outward to the rim, spilling over the edges. In the meanwhile, 99 percent of the solids have settled to the bottom, where long scraper arms concentrate the sludge in the deepest part. Heavy-duty pumps then remove the sludge.

These concentrated solids are pumped to a nearby filter house where more water is removed, leaving a wet cake of solid material to be dumped in a nearby impoundment. At present there is no practical use for these solids, but experiments are being conducted to see if they can be transformed into a useful byproduct.

Behind the clarifier stretches the 59-acre surface of the strong waste lagoon. Here is collected effluent that has a stronger concentration of oxygen-absorbing materials. The wastes are held for a period up to 2 weeks, during which time aeration and bacterial action reduces the oxygen demand.

At the end of the treatment period the water is released to the river at a carefully controlled rate. The strong waste system is designed to be modified as technical advances are made in the field of effluent control.

In addition to the three-way treatment system and the constant checking and double checking that goes on at the Demopolis plant, Gulf States technicians keep a constant watch on the river itself. Daily checks are made of the river's flow and of the dissolved oxygen content of the water. In periods of low water this monitoring process becomes almost constant and the lab boat travels 50 miles downstream from the plant and 5 miles upstream. Samples of water are taken at 16 different points and 5 tests are run on each sample.

The expanded effluent system at the Demopolis mill has involved the investment of over \$1 million. Operating it and monitoring the river require an annual expense of \$48,000, according to Gulf States technical personnel.

Veto of H.R. 8439

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 23, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, there is no issue more vital to the welfare of this Nation than that of separation of powers between the legislative and executive branches of Government.

August 23, 1965

riety of work calls for full-time help in itself nor does it call for highly trained specialists. In short, it is general assistance work of a varied nature to relieve our permanent staff of a summertime overload. It is an excellent opportunity and has been appreciated and enjoyed by these employees in the past.

We have paid minimum wages in the past just because such a minimum existed, not because we were forced to by law. A new minimum would establish a higher wage scale even where it was not required by law, but just by common practice and usage as well as by employee pressure and unwillingness to work "below minimum wages."

The effect on us will be to quit hiring summer students and to handle the slight overload by staggering vacations, rescheduling yearly operations, and working a little harder instead of granting long weekends, etc.

This will eliminate both the training and earning opportunity for the young people we have hired for many years.

While ours is a "small potato" operation, I think you can multiply this by many times in our area and in the Nation. We will not hire and train marginal employees but be forced to combine and reschedule so that our permanent employees can productively and economically handle our workload.

I'm afraid this bill reminds me of the man who joined the war against poverty by tossing a hand grenade at a bum.

U.S. Trading With Hanoi Traders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 23, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the United States, in our buildup in South Vietnam, is using ships from the same foreign countries which have been aiding Hanoi.

Ironically the sealift of American supplies to Saigon has required the use of ships flying the flags of the same free world countries helping to keep the Vietcong supplied. In effect we are still doing business with our friends even though they are trading with our enemies.

British, Norwegian, and Greek ship-owners have been paid almost \$2 million in freight rates alone since January of this year for hauling U.S. Government cargoes to South Vietnam. At the same time, British, Norwegian, and Greek ships as well as others from other allied countries, have made a total of 83 supply runs for the Communists by calling at ports in North Vietnam.

Our friendly shippers charged \$2 million for freight hauled to Saigon. Yet the price for freight these same friends hauled to Hanoi has been paid by the 315 American troops killed since January in battle against the Vietcong.

The State Department has stated that free world ships carry a substantial share of North Vietnam's seaborne imports. Since the United States has stepped up air attacks on North Vietnam's overland supply routes, Hanoi's dependence upon ports and shipping has increased, placing even greater importance on shipping.

Thus every allied ship call in North Vietnam is critical, particularly when the Communist ships are so busy hauling in missiles and other military cargoes.

Allied shipping to North Vietnam must be stopped.

Guilt Rests Upon the Individuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 23, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in all the casting about for explanations, for the Los Angeles riots it is my hope that serious attention will be given to the comment of Newspaper Columnist James J. Kilpatrick. His treatment of the subject appeared in the Washington Star for August 20.

The column follows:

GUILT RESTS UPON THE INDIVIDUALS

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

All week long, the leading bleeding hearts of the Great Society have been wetting down the ashes of Los Angeles with tears for the poor oppressed. We have been fairly awash in tales of Watts, the palm-lined "ghetto," with its unemployment, its crime, its incomes below \$4,000.

"The guilt lies on us all," said one lugubrious professor, gazing sadly into the camera. And he began to talk of frustrations that just had to find catharsis.

Twaddle. The guilt for this criminal anarchy in Los Angeles is direct, immediate, and personal, as guilt must always be if the first essentials of our law still count for anything. And if guilt is to be extended in some sort of metaphysical conjecture, then let the guilt lie squarely upon such philosophers as the Reverend Martin Luther King, and President Johnson.

What did the Negro apologists of our time expect? How could they have been surprised by these events? Have they never heard of the harvest that is reaped by men who sow the wind?

For the last 5 years or more, Dr. King has been going up and down the country, preaching his own brand of ever-loving anarchy. His is the gospel that tells his simple-minded people to violate the laws they feel in their hearts to be wrong. What is the guilt that lies today on Dr. King?

Dr. King is not alone. Over this same period, we have seen the White House itself and our Central Government as a whole contribute to the cynical disrespect for old institutions. The Constitution, once regarded as the supreme law of the land, has been progressively reduced to the merest scrap of paper. This Republic was founded in part, at least, upon respect for the ancient rights of private property; this was the oldest "human right" of them all, but Congress and the courts have let it erode away. Is it any wonder that the Los Angeles insurrectionists put private property to the torch?

Over the last 10 years, the American Negro has been singled out for a fulsome solicitude that has done him a terrible disservice. Through every conceivable device of law and politics, the Negro has been artificially puffed up, protected, pampered, wrapped in swaddling clothes, and excessively admired. He has been the particular object of public housing, poverty programs, job preferment, and aid for his illegitimate offspring. In the sanctified name of "civil rights," he has been

excused for criminal conduct that in any other set of facts would have drawn 30 days on the roads. The Supreme Court of the United States, casting precedent to the winds, pardons hundreds of trespassers, disturbers of the peace, and violators of the rights of other men—pardons them with a wave of judicial wands. What guilt lies on the Supreme Court of the United States?

It is high time in this country to cut through the fatty sentimentality, the phony guilt, the couch-ridden recriminations. If rhetorical questions are to be asked, should we not inquire if the status of the Negro, a century after emancipation, is entirely the fault of white society? Entirely? Or is a large part of this squarely the fault of the Negro people themselves?

It is said that the Negro has been kept down by the devices of segregation, and doubtless there is truth in this. But the whole of the proposition never is examined. Were all Negroes kept down? Or were many Negroes too lazy to get up? Say what you will about the South (it is not the South where whole cities go up in the flames of insurrection), the American Negro has had two generations of reasonable opportunity in the unsegregated North and West. How has he developed the opportunities put before him? In squalor, in apathy, in crime, in coddling off "the welfare," in dropping out of integrated schools, in breeding swarms of children out of wedlock. This is the sorry record. And now, in Los Angeles, we witness barbarian hordes.

What is the remedy? It is to treat the Negro like a white man. God knows his race has done little enough to deserve a fate so difficult and demanding. This is to expect of the Negro, first of all, work; and then self-restraint; obedience to law; respect for authority; creative imagination; right conduct. It is to expect of him some capacity for leadership, some positive contribution to the communities he lives in, some sense of common decency in the maintenance of neighborhoods. This is the white man's world—a world that earns its way, accepts responsibility, knows failure, knows success, and does not search for somewhere else to lay a personal blame.

Plenty of Negroes have shown they understand these elementary obligations. Especially in the South, a Negro middle class is rising, buying property, entering public life, setting a fine example of civic responsibility. Elsewhere in the country, examples multiply of individual excellence. If only the do-gooders will stop expecting too much of the Negro too soon. If only they will learn that pampering and special privilege and legislative crutches cannot do the job. If only they will understand that the character of a backward people cannot be tempered in Molotov cocktails.

Respect for law, respect for property, respect for the rights of others—these have to come first. And these must be enforced by the courts and by the suddenly stiffened demands of a fed-up society. The guilt for these outrages lies upon individual arsonists, hoodlums, vandals, thieves. Try them. And then turn to the political and intellectual leaders who need forgiveness more: They know not what they do.

The Christian Science Monitor has also made a great contribution in its lead editorial of August 21. It emphasizes that a respect for law is and must be the foundation upon which any community welfare is based. I hope the editorial receives wide attention. It follows here:

RESPECT FOR LAW

Nearly 2,500 years ago Aristotle pointed out a great truth about the law. He warned that laws will not be obeyed unless men acquire the habit of obeying them.

It is equally clear that anything which either encourages men to disregard law or

August 23, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4699

appeared from the index annually, including 36 of the original 92 products in the index. In all, 375 products have appeared in the index at one time or another. One therapeutic group has had 35 different products, and no group has had less than 12, with the average amounting to 22.

This turnover in the list of products attests to the dynamic character of the industry. This index has been specially designed to take cognizance of this unique phenomenon. It has also been necessary simultaneously to readjust the relative importance of the individual products and of the therapeutic groups to allow for these changes. However, let it be noted that no product can enter the index until it has become one of the five top products in its group; and then can only affect the index in the second year after its appearance therein. Thus, the initial offering price for a new product will not influence the index, since its price (at the end of the year) after having been on the market long enough to become a market leader will be realistic and competitive.

To further indicate the changing character of the pharmaceutical market, it is of interest to observe the changing importance of the therapeutic groups since 1949. The five most important groups in 1949, and their change in importance by 1964 is shown below:

Relative importance		
Group:	1949	1964
All other.....	21.4	10.2
Vitamins.....	12.9	3.1
Antibiotics.....	10.8	23.3
Hormones.....	10.4	9.2
Sedatives.....	6.2	2.4

If the classification is made on the basis of the most important groups in 1964, the following changes may be seen:

Relative importance		
Group:	1949	1964
Antibiotics.....	10.8	23.3
All other.....	21.4	10.2
Hormones.....	10.4	9.2
Ataractics.....	.0	9.2
Analgesics.....	4.1	8.6

Vitamins, sedatives, and all others have declined very sharply, while antibiotics and analgesics have more than doubled in importance. Ataractics, nonexistent in 1949, have become the fourth most important group.

Thus, it is apparent that the effect of price changes of vitamins on the index in 1949 was of much greater consequence than in 1964, while antibiotics were 2.2 times as important in 1964 compared with 1949. An index that does not reflect relative importance changes of such magnitude would be seriously deficient and inaccurate.

Prices used for the purpose of constructing the index are Red Book published prices and hence are highest offering prices to retailers. Actual prices paid by retailers are frequently less than Red Book published prices, and to this degree, the price index, while showing price trends accurately, does not always reflect the short-term fluctuations in prices caused by current market forces.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics index for drugs and pharmaceuticals prior to 1960 unfortunately could not adjust to the rapid changes in products and their importance so that it failed to measure the full extent of the price movements in this industry. As a result, the BLS index went from 100.1 in 1949 to 100.2 in 1960. In this same period the wholesale price index for ethical pharmaceuticals declined 7.6 percent. With the revision of the BLS index in January 1961 this index was made more realistic, and its behavior closely parallels the industry index since then.

JOHN M. FIRESTONE.

JUNE 30, 1965.

Tariffs on Sheet Glass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 23, 1965

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been warning the House of the dangerous conditions in many of our basic industries because of the uneconomic concept of free trade.

Today, I present this house resolution, adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania on August 17, 1965, by unanimous vote. This resolution gives very compelling reasons for the President of the United States to disregard idiotic and inconceivable, uneconomic decisions of the majority members of the Tariff Commission at which they recommended that the glass tariff be lowered back to the unrealistic rates, that the late President John F. Kennedy, found to be extremely dangerous to the continuation of the glass industry as such in the United States.

However, today we see our shelves piled higher and higher of foreign made products with their identity and manufacturing sources so well hidden that thousands of Americans buy such well known names as General Electric, Zenith, Westclox, and many others, completely ignorant of the fact that these products are foreign made.

It is a false premise to believe that foreign goods cost Americans less money. While this condition does exist when the foreign product is making its entry into the American market it soon disappears when American concerns become immersed by foreign production in American trade markets.

A close examination in the market place will show we are paying more today for Japanese products; for products once made in the United States.

While the resolution concerns itself with the problem of glass it could be applied to practically every product imported today which displaces American production.

The antipoverty program will fall flat on its face and many of the fine pieces of legislation promoted by the President and supported by your Congress, including myself, will fail to do that which they are designed to do unless we reassess our trade position and do it now.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution below has been sent to me by the Senate of Pennsylvania:

RESOLUTION BY SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

In 1962 the tariff on sheet glass was increased because of the serious effect that imported glass was having on the domestic industry. Prior to this increase the domestic industry was operating at a loss or on a marginal basis.

On June 11, 1965, the Tariff Commission reported to the President, in a split three to two decision, that a reduction of the present duties would have only a slight effect on the domestic industry.

The three majority commissioners made this recommendation in spite of the fact that the foreigners have the same percentage of

the market now (25 percent) as they had prior to the increase in duties. These three commissioners also concede that their recommendation is complicated by the fact that the increased duties have only been in effect for a very short period of time.

Both the majority and minority members of the commission found that a reduction in tariff would force a number of older and smaller plants to close. It is apparent, then, that steady employment in the glass industry and in the many industries serving the glass industry can be maintained only by keeping the tariff rates intact.

Most of the jobs lost and plants closed would be in already depressed areas, where the Government is spending millions of dollars to attract new industry, retain existing plants, and create jobs. Six industry plants, in fact, are in Appalachia, two of these in Pennsylvania; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania finds that the termination of the escape-clause duties imposed in 1962 could only be harmful to the business and labor interests of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and be it further

Resolved, That the senate respectfully urges President Lyndon B. Johnson to retain the present tariff that was established under the escape-clause increase of June 1962; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson, to the Tariff Commission, and to each U.S. Senator and Member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of senate resolution, serial No. 32A, introduced by Senators Richard C. Frame, Albert R. Pechan, Robert D. Fleming, and Paul W. Mahady and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 17th day of August, 1965.

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,

Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

Effect of Minimum Wage Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 23, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Record a letter from the secretary of the Rapid City, S. Dak., Builders Exchange to the chairman of the Labor Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee of the House.

The reason I have asked permission to insert it is because this is only one small example of thousands and thousands of businesses across the Nation who will be forced to stop hiring American youth if the increase in the minimum wage law goes through. I am not sure of the total amount the Federal Government is now spending on dropouts, but this minimum wage law will multiply that amount by several hundreds.

The letter is as follows:

It would appear that your proposal would most decidedly affect our operation and the employees we hire for summer assistance.

We have been hiring high school seniors and graduates for summer assistance. We have tried to improve and prepare them to meet people in person and over the phone—acquaint them with our various office equipment and activities, etc. None of this va-

August 23, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4701

diminishes men's respect for it strikes at the very heart of orderly, democratic, and progressive living. This does not mean that all laws are either right or perfect. It does not mean that laws should not change and evolve. But it does mean that the security, health, and progress of men and of nations lies in a respect for law and a willingness to obey it.

In the last few days two prominent Americans have addressed themselves to this very question, but from sharply different viewpoints. Commenting on the Los Angeles riots, former President Eisenhower said, "I believe the United States as a whole has been becoming atmospherized * * * in a policy of lawlessness. If we like a law, we obey it; if we don't, we are told: 'You can disobey it.'"

Also discussing the west coast rioting, New York Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY is quoted in an interview as saying that it was senseless to tell Negroes living in northern slums to obey the law, that to these Negroes the law is the enemy.

The Kennedy statement is deeply disturbing. Even granting the fact that many Negroes do in fact regard the law as their enemy, will the Kennedy statement do anything to change their view? Will it not, rather, give them the impression that influential national figures look with sympathy upon their breaking of the law? As a former Attorney General who had shown himself active in securing wider Negro protection under law, Senator KENNEDY is in a particularly favorable position to remind the Negro that the law is, in fact, his greatest safeguard. It is regrettable that this opportunity was missed.

We agree without reservation with President Eisenhower's statement: "I believe we must have greater respect for law. This means to me we must review our * * * moral standards."

Great efforts are now being made nationally on behalf of the Negro. Greater efforts will doubtless be made in the future. While it is true that many of these efforts are belated, it is also true that they are being made because the American people as a whole believe in the reign of justice. And justice without law is an impossibility.

Only through support of law and justice can any American citizen, Negro or white, hope to live in peace and prosperity. Law is man's present highest concept of that higher, perfect order toward which human progress tends. It must be protected, honored, fostered, and obeyed.



To Our Soldiers in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 23, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Jewish Veteran carries a front page editorial entitled, "To Our Soldiers in Vietnam."

This editorial, representing the official view of united Jewish war veterans, analyzes the role of Red China, not only in the "narrow confines" of the Vietnam struggle, "but also in the light of all its worldwide implications."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I request that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, and commend its careful reading to my colleagues:

TO OUR SOLDIERS IN VIETNAM

The veterans community of the United States wants you to know that we stand four-square in support of your sacrifice in the cause of freedom. As citizens who have borne arms for this Nation before you, we realize full well the importance to your morale and fighting spirit the assurance that the whole country is fully aware of the nature of your mission and the vital importance of it.

At the heart of the American involvement in Vietnam is the confrontation of the growing power and influence of the world's most dangerous and irresponsible nation—Red China.

Debates are in progress about the American strategies and tactics in Vietnam, the rights and wrongs of our involvement, and the issue of escalation. These are questions which should rightfully be examined and discussed in the Congress and by the public.

But we must not lose sight of the basic motivation for the pending mobilization of Reserves and the expanded American commitment in southeast Asia.

Red China leaves us no alternative but a firm stand on every periphery of that restive aggressive goliath.

We do not intend to make a case for the Saigon leaders of South Vietnam as the most perfect and desirable exponents of freedom. We hope and pray that better leadership for our side can be found. In the long struggle, we cannot defeat communism except through the dynamic appeal of a better idea—the true ideology of freedom.

But in the larger picture, we are confronted with such a massive peril that the deficiencies of the Saigon regime are somewhat beside the main point. The basic issue at hand is the dedication of China, a nation whose population is three or four times as large as our own, to defeat and obliterate us. To them we are the mortal foe. They have served notice that they intend to crush us and our way of life.

Today, China has the atomic bomb. Crude though their weapon may be when compared with the supermegaton power in American hands, the fact remains that the least responsible regime on earth has the power to ignite a thermonuclear conflict. Millions of Chinese may be wiped out. But other nations could be involved in a holocaust which Russia might not be able to avoid despite its present differences with Chinese extremism.

RED CHINA AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Right now, China is seeking to gain her ends by exploiting so-called wars of national liberation. That is her role in the bloody, confused and unhappy affair in Vietnam. It also seems to be her objective elsewhere, even in the Near East where the Chinese are seeking among other goals, to foment Arab guerrilla violence against Israel to create a tactical diversion to Vietnamese conflict.

Let us also examine the role of Red China toward Israel. Peiping blackballed Israel back in the days of the Bandung Conference of Asian Nations, alleging that Israel was "an imperialist creature" and had no right to exist. Israel had previously recognized Red China diplomatically because, whether one likes it or not, Red China exists. But Peiping did not reciprocate and rejected a diplomatic exchange because her only thought of Israel was as a scapegoat to use in appealing for Arab sympathies.

Arab guerrilla attacks on Israel, if carried to lengths that would inflame the whole tense frontier problem, would spread, confuse, and intensify the world crisis. It would help the Vietcong by keeping American forces on the alert in the Mediterranean and Europe. The U.S. 6th Fleet, for instance, could not relinquish its marine components for duty in the Far East, if trouble were brewing in the Near East.

Such a move would also inflame the Arab masses to serve Chinese ends by intimidating Arab leaders into closer support of the Peiping line. China, instead of Russia would become the most militant activist and leading exponent of Arab fanaticism against Israel.

Peiping feels that an Arab-Israel war could diminish mounting American pressure in Vietnam, extricate China from a military showdown for the present, and provide more time for development of atomic weapons and delivery systems. Such strife is consistent with Chinese attempts to foment "anti-imperialist" disorder throughout southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Offers have already been made by China to the extremist "liberation front" of Palestinian Arab refugees. Headed by Arab agitator Ahmed Shukairy, an Arab delegation was welcomed to Peiping and promised money, weapons, and military training if they would launch a "liberation war" against Israel. China envisaged internal sabotage by Israel's Arab population, creation of an armed underground movement, bombings, sabotage, and infiltration raids from outside.

Mao Tse-tung told the Arabs that "an Algerian delegation told us once that Algeria lost a million lives in the guerrilla struggle for independence. I told them that peoples should not be frightened if their population decreases in the course of a liberation war, for they will enjoy a period of peace afterward in which they can again multiply."

Peiping considers it ridiculous that 45 million Arabs surrounding 2½ million Israelis do not crush the Jews with action and blood instead of mere words and promises as espoused by Egypt's Nasser and others.

Nasser and Shukairy are not quite ready for a "peoples' war" against Israel because they know that Israel has the power to hit back and that the United States might not stand idly by. Nasser fears that the Sinai zone might become another Danang, poised against Arab infiltration if the "masses" ever materialized on a Vietcong-type rampage.

Mao subsequently condemned Arab lack of militance as "bourgeois humanitarianism." They are "too preoccupied with survival," he charged. But he hopes eventually, inexorably, to enlist the Arabs in a Near Eastern escalation in keeping with the insidious and subversive Chinese strategies.

Therefore, when we support our Government and its actions in Vietnam we do so not only within the narrow confines of that area but also in the light of all its worldwide implications.

Castro Threat Not So Empty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 23, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, so far as the public is concerned, there seems to be no attention being paid to Castro and his regime in Cuba as constituting a threat to the Western Hemisphere.

I was glad to note the following article written by Marguerite Higgins which appeared in the Washington Star:

CASTRO THREAT NOT SO EMPTY

(By Marguerite Higgins)

Until recently, Johnson administration officials tended to shrug off Cuban Premier Fidel Castro's boasts of turning Latin American wars of liberation into Vietnam-type conflicts.

A4702

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 23, 1965

And in its preoccupation with Vietnam, the American public has failed to notice very significant and troubling developments south of the border.

But events are not only proving that Castro's threats are not so empty, but are also calling into question many of the smug assumptions about developments in such places as Venezuela.

Any comparisons to Vietnam area are of course to the earliest stages of that war when victims of terror and ambush were listed by the dozens rather by the thousands.

ASSUMPTION IN VENEZUELA

With regard to Venezuela, it has been assumed in Washington that the success 2 years ago in holding free elections in spite of opposition from Communist terrorists had more or less settled the guerrilla problem.

After all, it was reasoned the Venezuelan Government was freely chosen, left of center, and very progressive in social good works. More than most people on this earth, Americans cling to the myth that good government is of itself a defense against Communist guerrillas.

Very handily for the Communists, we have been brainwashed into assuming that Communist terrorists can thrive only if most of the people are against a government. It is a very unhistoric assumption.

In Europe, the destruction of Czechoslovakia's popular and progressive government by a Communist minority is just one of many examples of the fact that the Communists usually take over in spite of the will of the majority.

VENEZUELA LESSON

In Venezuela, the lesson is that terrorist guerrillas, if supported from the outside (Cuba) can dangerously increase their troublemaking capacity in spite of good government—a government that has among other things effectively worked at matters of land reform and helping the peasantry.

As in Vietnam, the peasants of Venezuela may hate the guerrillas, but they will not expose them for fear of torture and death.

The discovery of 5 tons of armaments hidden in the San Antonio Del Gauche region of Venezuela this week follows a gun battle in the same area between military forces and guerrillas. A secret guerrilla headquarters of the FALN (National Liberation Armed Forces) was even uncovered in the petroleum center of Anzoategui State.

TRAINING FOR GUERRILLAS

But if Castro and company have their way, this is but a foretaste of far worse to come.

According to reliable reports reaching Washington, guerrilla training—once confined to Cuba itself—is going on in the Venezuelan States of Lara and Falcon. The guerrilla chieftain is a former Venezuelan newspaper man, Fabricio Ojeda.

The Venezuelan National Liberation Front believes in the formalities. It is officially represented in Cuba by German Layret, who recently went through the formality of signing a "mutual aid pact" with the Vietcong representative in Havana.

Castro's press and radio made much of this and openly boasted that the pact heralded the start of Vietnam-type wars, not just in Venezuela but in other parts of Latin America. Clearly, the Communist guerrillas, like their counterparts in Asia, are planning carefully and diabolically for the years ahead. Weapons and central direction are coming from Cuba and will continue to do so—as long as the United States permits this to go on.

The question is whether the United States can afford to look the other way while Cuba provides the transmission belt for weapons with which the Communists plan to subvert the hemisphere.

In Vietnam, we waited until almost the 11th hour before attempting seriously to interrupt outside sources of supply of men

and material. Isn't there a lesson to be learned from that tragedy? Or are we to be paralyzed into inaction by failing to take seriously Castro's threats of turning Latin America into a series of Vietnam's?

One Woman Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 23, 1965

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, in this time of domestic turmoil and international crisis, it is refreshing to hear some one speak with a calm sane voice. For this reason I have asked permission to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my friend, Mrs. George L. Burr's column, "One Woman Comments," which appeared in the August 19, 1965, issue of the Winter Haven, Fla., Herald.

Josephine Burr, as she is known to her many friends and readers, gives sound advice that is worthy of the attention of readers of all ages—not just the young people entering college to whom these remarks were addressed. If more people lived Mrs. Burr's philosophy, this world would be a more stable and more wholesome place in which to live:

ONE WOMAN COMMENTS

(By Josephine G. Burr)

Let us forget the trials of the National Council of Churches this week while I write a letter to my granddaughter. She is only 6 and starting to school, but I am going to pretend that she is 18 and starting to college because I hope some college-bound boy or girl will read this and possibly think a bit more carefully when he gets to the campus.

DEAREST VICKIE: I know you are a bit fearful as you leave home this fall, for you are actually going out into the world alone for the first time. A college or university campus is a world of its own and a place where you will meet all kinds of people. You will either thoroughly enjoy your life there, as I did, or be heartsick because you did not realize your great opportunity to learn what life is all about. Life of today is much more complicated than it was for me 50 years ago, however, so I think maybe I can help if you will heed.

First you young folks are much more aware of what is going on in the world today than we were back in 1913. There are peculiar "isms" abroad in the land, wild-eyed terrorists, and some who believe communism will save the world from destruction. But there are also many good ideas, many fine thinkers. I hope you have absorbed from your problems class in high school or the course you took in communism that Florida high schools require, the dangers that lurk in these peculiar subversive minds. I am sure you read of the troubles the Berkeley, Calif., campus had last fall. Many people thought it all the fault of Communist off-campus folk who created this trouble. I think they had their part in it, but let's face it, there is unrest on every college campus today created by this changing world in which we find ourselves. The "Wave of the Future" that Ann Morrow Lindbergh wrote about back in the 1940's has overtaken us. Every nation, however small, is trying for the highest kind of freedom and to equal the good things that we here in America have enjoyed for so long. They hate us for having found them first, and since

this is the "land of the free and the home of the brave," they are trying to prove, in their strivings, that we are wrong and they are right. Revolution is in the air and the world is so rampant for freedom that we begin to wonder if we are as free as we have always taken for granted we were. Let us not waiver—ever—in our ideas of what freedom really is and how to keep it. That is what you young folks of today must work to preserve.

One thing I want to emphasize as you start your college career—please do your own thinking. You will doubt yourself at times and your ability to think right, but do not allow the thoughts of someone else to become yours unless you have spent hours trying to find out the truth about controversial subjects. You, Vickie, have been fortunate in growing up in a normal home. Many of the young people you will meet have warped minds because they were not so fortunate. Grief, money troubles, broken homes, liquor, can tear up lives and create so much unhappiness, especially in young people's minds, that they become unstable in their thinking and their emotions. Look into the background of those who seem different and try to discover why they are different—then feel sorry, be tolerant, but do your own thinking.

But we were discussing freedom. When I was in college no one questioned it. Since then we have helped France and England preserve their freedoms in World War I, then again in World War II when the madman, Hitler, tried to change things to his warped mind's way of thinking, we sent our young men to fight for freedom. Now the Russians, who realized they were being ruled by a mad king, cannot seem to be happy just changing their own world. They are being led by the ideologies of three other mad men, Karl Marx of Germany, Lenin, and Stalin. But something has happened in our own land of the free that is very frightening. We do not all seem to appreciate that our Founding Fathers planned well and there are too many Americans trying to change our world.

Two characteristic stand out in all this strife of today—hate and fear. They are not new—they ruled the German Kaiser, they definitely ruled Hitler, and today they rule all the odd people who think change is the only road to freedom. The one thing to me that will make you realize we have been and still are on the right track in America, will be your absorbing the education that you are about to undertake. However, you must keep your feet on the ground; you must believe, as you have been taught, that there is a God above us all who strives to help us; and that if you live by the Golden Rule, you cannot get off the right course for long. Education also means tolerance to me, Vickie, for all people are not made alike—everyone has his good points and his bad ones. Just be sure you can tell the difference and are not led by bigotry or mass thinking, but by your own careful estimation of what is the best course. I am sure you will know and if you become confused, pick out a person you love and trust and talk it all out.

One last admonition and to me it is very important. I want you to have fun and enjoy your college life as well as its opportunities, and the best way to do this is to join with a group of congenial folks in a Greek letter society. Today they are the last sure bulwark of Americanism on the college campus. They exist for the sake of friendship; they are governed by men and women who have been careful in their thinking. Their first loyalty is to God and country and they provide a "home away from home" where you can find folks reared as you were reared, girls and boys who think about life as you do and have been forewarned by parents and fraternity elders about the dangers of today. You will find folks you can talk to and discuss things with, but best of all, you will find real friends.